No. 615 LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD.

Office - Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 1 5 1957
JOHN T. FEY, Clerk

UNITED STATES
COURT OF APPEALS

FIFTH CIRCUIT.

No. 16,140

GEORGE T. NISHIDA and JAMES E. NISHIDA d/b/a HILO DAIRY COMPANY OF KAUAI; RYOJU SOKEI, d/b/a SOKEI DAIRY, and FRED L. WALDRON, LIMITED,

Appellants,

versus

E. I. DuPONT de NEMOURS & COMPANY,

Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi.

(ORIGINAL RECORD RECEIVED JUN. 4/56.)

INDEX

	PAGE
Appellee's Designation as to Printing Record	1
Exhibit "A"—Counter-Designation of Defendant of Additional Portions of Record on Appeal	9
Appellants' Designation as to Printing Record	15
Joint Stipulation as to Printing Certain Portions of the Record as designated by Appellee, dated 6/9/56	18
Proceedings in Case, George T. Nishida, et al., etc. vs. E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., Case No. 142-Civil:	
Complaint	25
Plaintiffs' Demand for Jury Trial	42
Answer of Defendant to Complaint	43
Motion of Defendant for Summary Judgment	54
Notice of Hearing on above Motion	55
Affidavit of Clark B. Shepherd, dated 9/21/54 ..	57
Affidavit of R. Stuart Armstrong, dated 9/21/54	61
Exhibit "A"—Opinion rendered by the Supreme Court of Miss., in Case E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co. vs. Frank Ladner, Case No. 39,116	64
Exhibit "B"—Letter, E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., to Lyman Reed, Sales Mgr., Magnolia Soy Products Co., dated 7/13/51	81
Affidavit of Charles A. Kline, Jr., dated 9/29/54	84
Order entered 1/18/55 Denying Motion of Defendant for Summary Judgment	85
Motion of Plaintiffs' for Joint Trial and Consolidation	87
Affidavit of Rogers E. Brooks, dated 11/14/55 ..	89

INDEX—Continued

PAGE

Order entered 11/22/55 Consolidating Cases Nos. 142, 143 and 145 Civil Action for Trial 92
Joint Stipulation of Counsel relative to Depositions of Lawrence W. Campos, et al. 94
Joint Stipulation of Counsel relative to Original Documents tendered in Evidence, etc. 96
Verdict of the Jury, entered 11/29/55 97
Memorandum relative to Direction for Entry of Judgment 97
Motion of Plaintiffs' for New Trial 98
Final Judgment 106
Judgment, entered 12/2/55 107
Notice of Appeal 108
Motion of Plaintiffs' to Extend Time for Filing Record on Appeal in Appellate Court (Omitted) 109
Order entered 4/10/56 Extending Time to File Record on Appeal in Appellate Court (Omitted) 109
Appellants' Designation of Contents of Record on Appeal 109
Appellants' Statement of Points on Appeal 113
Appellants' Designation of Contents of Record on Appeal (Omitted) 120
Motion of Plaintiffs' for Transmission of Original Depositions with the attached Exhibits to Appellate Court 121
Order entered 5 21 56 transmitting Original Depositions and Exhibits in lieu of all copies to Appellate Court 123
Appellee's Counter-Designation of Additional Portions of Contents of Record on Appeal 125

INDEX—Continued

PAGE

Order entered 5/29/56 transmitting Original Depositions and Exhibits and Court files in lieu of all copies to Appellate Court 132

Proceedings In Case, Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy vs. E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., Case No. 145-Civil:

Complaint 134
Plaintiffs' Demand for Jury Trial 152
Answer of Defendant to Complaint 152
Motion of Defendant for Summary Judgment (Omitted) 163
Notice of Hearing on above Motion (Omitted) 163
Affidavit of Clark B. Shepherd, dated 9/21/54 (Omitted) 163
Affidavit of R. Stuart Armstrong, dated 9/21/54 (Omitted) 163
Exhibit "A"—Opinion rendered by the Supreme Court of Miss., in Case E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co. vs. Frank Ladner, Case No. 39,116 (Omitted) 163
Exhibit "B"—Letter, E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., to Lyman Reed, Sales Mgr., Magnolia Soy Products Co., dated 7/31/51 (Omitted) 163
Affidavit of Charles A. Cline, Jr., dated 9/29/54 (Omitted) 163
Order entered 1/18/55 Denying Motion of Defendant for Summary Judgment (Omitted) 163
Memorandum relative to Motion for Consolidation, etc. (Omitted) 163
Joint Stipulation of Counsel relative to Deposition of Frank Fernandez 164

INDEX—Continued

PAGE

Joint Stipulation of Counsel relative to Depositions of Lawrence W. Campos, et al. 165
Joint Stipulation dated 7/11/55 that plaintiff may tender in evidence at the trial copies of Original Documents, etc. 166
Memorandum as to Verdict (Omitted) 167
Motion of Plaintiff for New Trial (Omitted) 167
Order entered 2/2/56 Denying Motion of Plaintiff for New Trial (Omitted) 167
Judgment, entered 12/2/55 (Omitted) 167
Notice of Appeal 168
Motion of Plaintiffs to Extend Time for Filing Record on Appeal in Appellate Court (Omitted) 168
Order entered 4/10/56 Extending Time to File Record on Appeal in Appellate Court (Omitted) 168
Appellants' Designation of Contents of Record on Appeal (Omitted) 168
Appellants' Statement of Points on Appeal (Omitted) 168
Appellants' Designation of Record (Omitted) 169
Motion of Plaintiffs' for Transmission of Original Depositions with the attached Exhibits to Appellate Court (Omitted) 169
Order entered 5/21/56 transmitting Original Depositions and Exhibits in lieu of all copies to Appellate Court (Omitted) 169
Appellee's Counter-Designation of Additional Portions of Contents of Record on Appeal (Omitted) 169
Order entered 5/29/56 transmitting Original Depositions and Exhibits and Court Files in lieu of all copies to Appellate Court (Omitted) 169

Proceedings in Case, Fred L. Walton, Ltd. vs. E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., Case No. 143-Civil:

INDEX—Continued

	PAGE
Complaint	170
Plaintiff's Demand for Jury Trial	186
Answer of Defendant to Complaint	186
Motion of Defendant for Summary Judgment (Omitted)	196
Notice of Hearing on above motion (Omitted)	196
Affidavit of Clark B. Shepherd, dated 9/21/54 (Omitted)	196
Affidavit of R. Stuart Armstrong, dated 9/21/54 (Omitted)	196
Exhibit "A"—Opinion rendered by the Supreme Court of Miss., in Case, E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co. vs. Frank Ladner, Case No. 39,116 (Omitted)	196
Exhibit "B"—Letter, E. I. duPont de Nemours & Co., to Lyman Reed, Sales Mgr., Magnolia Soy Products Co., dated 7/31/51 (Omitted)	196
Affidavit of Charles A. Cline, Jr., dated 9/29/54 (Omitted)	197
Order entered 1/18/55 Denying Motion of Defendant for Summary Judgment (Omitted)	197
Memorandum Relative to Motion for Consolidation (Omitted)	197
Stipulation of Counsel relative to Depositions of Elmer Sokei, et al.	197
Stipulation of Counsel relative to Depositions of S. Yama, et al.	198
Stipulation of Counsel relative to Original Documents tendered in Evidence, etc.	199
Memorandum as to Verdict (Omitted)	200
Motion of Plaintiff for New Trial (Omitted)	200
Order entered 2/2/56 Denying Motion of Plaintiff for New Trial (Omitted)	200

INDEX—Continued

	PAGE
Judgment, entered 12/2/55 (Omitted)	200
Notice of Appeal	201
Motion of Plaintiffs to Extend Time for filing Record on Appeal in Appellate Court (Omitted)	201
Order entered 4/10/56 Extending time to file Record on Appeal in Appellate Court (Omitted)	201
Appellants' Designation of Contents of Record on Appeal (Omitted)	201
Appellants' Statement of Points on Appeal (Omitted)	202
Appellants' Designation of Record (Omitted)	202
Motion of Plaintiffs' for transmission of Original Depositions with the attached Exhibits to Appellate Court (Omitted)	202
Order entered 5/21/56 transmitting Original Depositions and Exhibits in lieu of all copies to Appellate Court (Omitted)	202
Appellee's Counter-Designation of additional Portions of Contents of Record on Appeal (Omitted)	202
Order entered 5/29/56 transmitting Original Depositions and Exhibits and Court Files in Lieu of all copies to Appellate Court (Omitted)	202
Plaintiffs' Request for Instructions	203
Motion of Defendant at the close of Plaintiffs' Case for a Directed Verdict in Case No. 142-Civil (Omitted)	222
Motion of Defendant at the close of Plaintiffs' Case for a Directed Verdict in Case No. 142-Civil (Omitted)	222
Motion of Defendant at the close of Plaintiffs' Case for a Directed Verdict in Case No. 143-Civil (Omitted)	222

INDEX—Continued

PAGE

Motion of Defendant at the close of Plaintiffs' Case for a Directed Verdict in Case No. 143-Civil (Omitted) 222
Motion of Defendant at the close of Plaintiffs' Case for a Directed Verdict in Case No. 145-Civil 223
Memorandum of Amendments Proposed to Complaint in Case No. 142-Civil 228
Motion of Defendant at the close of Plaintiffs' Case for a Directed Verdict in Case No. 145-Civil 229
Memorandum of Amendments Proposed to Complaint in Case No. 143-Civil 233
Memorandum of Amendments Proposed to Complaint in Case No. 145-Civil 236
Motion of Defendant at the close of all the Evidence for a Directed Verdict in Case No. 142-Civil, Overruled (Omitted) 240
Motion of Defendant at the close of all the Evidence for a Directed Verdict in Case No. 142-Civil (Omitted) 240
Motion of Defendant at the close of all the Evidence for a Directed Verdict in Case No. 143-Civil (Omitted) 240
Motion of Defendant at the close of all the Evidence for a Directed Verdict in Case No. 143-Civil (Omitted) 241
Motion of Defendant at the close of all the Evidence for a Directed Verdict in Case No. 145-Civil 241
Motion of Defendant at the close of all the Evidence for a Directed Verdict in Case No. 145-Civil 246

Transcript of Proceedings:
Colloquy between Court and Counsel 250
Statement made by the Court to Counsel 250
Statement made by the Court to the Jurors .. 251

INDEX—Continued

	PAGE
Transcript of Proceedings—(Continued):	
Colloquy between Court and Counsel	252
Jury sworn, etc.	252
Stipulation relative to the testimony given by the witness L. L. Ford in Case entitled Frank Ladner vs. E. I. duPont de Nemours & Co., and the Magnolia Soy Products Co., heard in the Circuit Court of Pearl River County, Miss., etc.	253
Evidence for Plaintiffs:	
Portions of Deposition of L. L. Ford	255
Testimony of Raymond T. Vaughn	337
Motion of Defendant at the close of Plaintiffs' Case for a Directed Verdict and Ruling thereon	357
Evidence for Defendant:	
Testimony of Frank McDonald	361
R. Stuart Armstrong	391
R. Stuart Armstrong (Resumed)	411
C. B. Shepherd	441
Charge of the Court	481
Exception of Defendant to Portion of Charge of the Court	493
Colloquy between Court and Counsel	495
Statement made by the Court	497
Proposed Special Charges requested by Plaintiffs, withdrawn and signed	499
Exception of Plaintiffs to the Court's Ruling Denying the submission of the Proposed Instructions to the Jury	500
Oral Opinion of the Court Overruling motion of Plaintiffs for New Trial	502
Clerk's Certificate	503

INDEX—Continued

PAGE

EXHIBITS.

Defendant Exhibit #1—Photostat of List of Cattle at Hilo Dairy 505

Defendant Exhibit #2—Photostat of Ledger Account for cattle for Hilo Dairy 506

Defendant Exhibit #3—Photostat of Summary of Cows Purchased since July 1, 1946-1950 507

Defendant Exhibit #4—Photostat of Letter, Lyman Reed to F. G. Low, dated 10/11/49 510

Defendant Exhibit #5—Photostat of Chemical Safety Data Sheets SD-14 Adopted 1947 Trichlorethylene, Manufacturing Chemists' Association of the United States, Washington, D.C., and other printed matter . 511

Defendant Exhibit #6—Photostat of Underwriters Laboratories Card on Cleaning Liquid 524

Defendant Exhibit #7—Photostat of Printed Material on Du Pont Chlorinated Hydrocarbons 526

Photostat of Graph of Vapor Pressures of Du Pont Chlorohydrocarbons 529

Photostat of Comparison of Chlorinated Hydrocarbons with other Industrial Organic Solvents 531

Defendant Exhibit #8—Photostat of Letter, Magnolia Soy Products Co., to C. B. Shepherd, dated 2/14/52 535

Defendant Exhibit #9—Photostat of an Excerpt from "Feedstuffs" a Weekly Newspaper, dated Oct. 6, 1951 537

INDEX—Continued

PAGE

EXHIBITS—(Continued):

Defendant Exhibit #10—Photostat of Letter, C. B. Shepherd to Lyman Reed, dated 7/31/51 538

Defendant Exhibit #11—Photostat from Order Magnolia Soy Products Co., to E. I. duPont, the Order having been entered Oct. 2, 1951, and the invoice being dated Nov. 21, 1951 539

Defendant Exhibit #12—Photostat of Factory Shipping Advice from duPont to Magnolia Soy Products Co. shipping date shown as November 19, 1951 540

Defendant Exhibit #13—Photostat of Acknowledgment of Order from duPont to Magnolia Soy Products Co., showing the Order entered October 2, 1951 showing front and reverse 541

Defendant Exhibit #14(a)—Photostat of Uniform Straight Bill of Lading issued by Illinois Central Railroad Co., showing car No. IC-27893 was received for shipment in Greenville, Miss., on 11/26/51 543

Defendant Exhibit #14(b)—Photostat of Memorandum Bill of Lading issued by Illinois Central Railroad, showing that car No. IC-27831 was received for shipment in Greenville, Miss., on 11/26/51 545

Defendant Exhibit #14(c)—Photostat of Uniform Bill of Lading issued by Illinois Central Railroad Co., showing car number IC-32008 was received for shipment in Greenville, Miss., on 11/23/51 547

INDEX--Continued

PAGE

EXHIBITS—(Continued):

Defendant Exhibit #15(a)—Photostat of Memorandum Bill of Lading issued by Illinois Central Railroad Company, showing that car No. NYC-178296 was received for shipment on 11/26/51 549

Defendant Exhibit #15(b)—Photostat of Memorandum Bill of Lading issued by Illinois Central Railroad Co., showing that car No. SOU-22061 was received for shipment on 12/8/51 551

Defendant Exhibit #15(c)—Photostat of Shipping Order of Illinois Central Railroad Co., showing that car No. NH-33672 was received for shipment from Greenville, Miss., on 12/10/51 553

Defendant Exhibit #16—Request of the Court to take judicial notice of the law of the State of New York 555

APPELLEE'S DESIGNATION AS TO PRINTING RECORD.

Filed June 5, 1956.

No. 16,140.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT.

GEORGE T. NISHIDA and JAMES E. NISHIDA, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a Co-Partnership,

RYOJU SOKEI, doing business as Sokei Dairy, FRED L. WALDRON, LIMITED,

Appellants,

versus

E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & COMPANY, a Corporation,

Appellee.

Pursuant to Rule 23(1), Rules of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, E. I du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, Defendant in each of the three cases heretofore pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division, and as Appellee in the case styled and numbered as aforesaid in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, wherein said three District Court cases are now pending before this Honorable Court as one case, hereby requests and directs the Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit to print, except

as otherwise designated by Appellee as set forth below and on the following pages, and include in the printed Record on Appeal in the cause above styled and numbered (in addition to the portions of the record designated to be printed by Plaintiffs-Appellants in said cause, which Designation for Printing by Appellants is included in the original Appeal Record forwarded to this Court by the District Court), all of those portions of the Trial Court record which are described and set forth in the "Counter-Designation of Additional Portions of Record on Appeal" which was filed by said Defendant-Appellee in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division, on May 29, 1956, in each of said three cases, all of which are now brought to this Court as one case on appeal.

For the convenience of the Clerk of this Court, a copy of said "Counter-Designation of Additional Portions of Record on Appeal", as filed in the Trial Court in one of said cases, to-wit, Civil Action No 145, styled "Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff, v. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant", is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A", and made a part hereof. Said copy, thus marked and made Exhibit "A", save and except the caption of the particular cause, is identical with the like designated instrument filed in each of the two other causes in the Trial Court, to-wit, in Civil Actions Nos. 142 and 143, with the further exception that in Civil Action No. 142, because of the presence of two Plaintiffs therein, wheresoever the word "Plaintiff's " appears in Exhibit "A" attached hereto, the word "Plaintiffs' " appears in said Civil Action No. 142.

In the printing of the additional portions set forth in said "Counter-Designation of Additional Portions of Record on Appeal", copy of which is made Exhibit "A" hereto, in order to save unnecessary expense and to avoid duplication, Appellee now requests and directs the Clerk of this Court, and the printer for him, to deal with certain items set forth in said "Counter-Designation of Additional Portions of Record on Appeal" in the manner following:

A.

As to te Motions set forth in Items 1, 3, 5, and 7 in said "Counter-Designation of Additional Portions of Record on Appeal", copy of which is made Exhibit "A" hereto, print only said Motions as they appear in the case styled and numbered "Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff, v. E. I. du pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant, Civil Action No. 145", (hereinafter referred to as the Sokei case), with the comments or notations made at the top of said printing made as now specifically described as to each of said items, the reason for this request and direction being that the applicable Motion in said Sokei case is identical with a like Motion made in the other two cases, to-wit, in Civil Actions Nos. 142 and 143, except as now otherwise noted. To be more specific on the score, Appellee now suggests the following notations to appear before each of the Motions to be printed from said Sokei case:

(a) As to Item 1, being the "Motion of Defendant for a Directed Verdict", as to the Complaint and any and all Counts thereof, made at the close of Plaintiff's case, insert the following notation preceding said Motion:

"(Caption omitted. Filed November 28, 1955. The following Motion was made in each of the three cases appealed from, in identical language, except when the word 'Plaintiff' hereinafter appears, the applicable word in the Nishida case is 'Plaintiffs'.)"

(b) As to Item 3, being the "Motion of Defendant for a Directed Verdict" on Counts One, Two and Three, known as the Contract Counts, made at the close of Plaintiff's case, insert the following notation preceding said Motion:

"(Caption omitted. Filed November 28, 1955. The following Motion was made in each of the three cases appealed from, in identical language, except when the word 'Plaintif' hereinafter appears, the applicable word in the Nishida case is 'Plaintiffs', and except in the Waldron case, Paragraph 7 is entirely omitted.)"

(c) As to Item 5, being the "Motion of Defendant for a Directed Verdict", as to the Complaint and any and all Counts thereof, made at the close of all the evidence in the case, insert the following notation preceding said Motion:

"(Caption omitted. Filed November 29, 1955 The following Motion was made in each of the three cases appealed from, in identical language, except when the word 'Plaintiff' hereinafter appears, the applicable word in the Nishida case is 'Plaintiffs'.)"

(d) As to Item 7, being the "Motion of Defendant for a Directed Verdict", on Counts One, Two and Three, known as the Contract Counts, made at the

close of all the evidence in the case, insert the following notation preceding said Motion:

"(Caption omitted. Filed November 29, 1955. The following Motion was made in each of the three cases appealed from, in identical language, except when the word 'Plaintiff' hereinafter appears, the applicable word in the Nishida case is 'Plaintiffs', and in the Waldron case, Paragraph 7 is entirely omitted.)"

B.

As to the "Order of the Court" referred to in Items 2, 4, 6 and 8 in said "Counter-Designation of Additional Portions of Record on Appeal", copy of which is made Exhibit "A" hereto, inasmuch as each of said orders overruled or denied, in the composite, the applicable Motion as made by Defendant in each of the three cases appealed from, each of said orders need be printed only one time, as to each of said Items 2, 4, 6 and 8.

C.

As to "all Exhibits" set forth in Item 9 in said "Counter-Designation of Additional Portions of Record on Appeal, copy of which is made Exhibit "A" hereto, inasmuch as the exhibits therein referred to, being Defendant's Exhibits D-1 through D-16, were introduced on the trial when all of the three cases appealed from were consolidated, and inasmuch as all of said exhibits are being forwarded to the Court of Appeals as originals and the Trial Court has ordered that none of them be duplicated, printed or reproduced, none of said exhibits shall be printed.

D.

As to "all colloquies between Counsel" set forth in Item 10 of the "Counter-Designation of Additional Portions of Record on Appeal", copy of which is made Exhibit "A" hereto, inasmuch as all three cases appealed from were consolidated for trial in the Trial Court, which colloquies appear from Page 439 to Page 463, both inclusive, of the Typewritten Transcript, said "colloquies between Counsel, and between Court and Counsel" need be printed only one time, that is, by one printing plate.

E.

As to "This Counter-Designation" set forth in Item 11 in said "Counter-Designation of Additional Portions of Record on Appeal," copy of which is made Exhibit "A" hereto, as made in each of the three cases, are identical with the exceptions below noted, print only the said instrument as appears in the Sokei case with the following notation to appear before the same:

"(Caption omitted. Filed May 29, 1956. The following instrument was filed in each of the three cases appealed from, in identical language, except when the word 'Plaintiff's' hereinafter appears, the applicable word in the Nishida case is 'Plaintiffs'.)"

Dated this the 5th day of June, 1956.

EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas),

Office and post office address:
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi.

CARL E. GEUTHER,
Attorneys for E. I. duPont de Nemours & Company, Appellee herein.

Office and post office address:
7098 Du Pont Building,
Wilmington, Delaware.
WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi,
Of Counsel.

Affidavit of Service.

State of Mississippi,
County of Hinds.

Earl T. Thomas, being by me first duly sworn, makes oath that he has served the above and foregoing "Appellee's Designation of Portions of the Record to be Printed", on Counsel for Plaintiffs-Appellants by mailing this date, first class air mail, postage prepaid, true copies thereof, respectively, to the following Attorneys of Record for said Plaintiffs-Appellants, at the following respective addresses thereof:

William G. Burgin, Jr., Esq.,
516 North Second Avenue,
Columbus, Mississippi.

Roger E. Brooks, Esq.,
923—20th Street, N. W.,
Washington 6, D. C.

Nils Tavares, Esq.,
Messrs. Pratt, Tavares & Cassidy,
Alexander & Baldwin Building,
Honolulu, Hawaii.

Shiro Kashiwa, Esq.,
Messrs. Kashiwa & Kashiwa,
Hawaiian Trust Building,
Honolulu, Hawaii.

David Ingman, Esq.,
Alexander Young Building,
Honolulu, Hawaii.

EXHIBIT "A"

Counter-Designation of Additional Portions of Record on Appeal

United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division

Ryan Sokes, doing business as Ryan Sales Manual

v. Civil Action No. 68

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant

Please take notice that E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, Defendant-Appellee, hereby designates the following portions of the record and proceedings, in addition to those designated by Appellant, to be certified by the Clerk of the United States District Court aforesaid and to be filed with the Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in the record on appeal in this action:

1. Motion to Determine Jurisdictional Amount and to Dismiss Action, filed in the above entitled cause on the 21st day of March, 1968.

2. Order of the Court dated March 21, 1968, overruling Motion to Determine Jurisdictional Amount and to Dismiss Action, filed in the above entitled cause on the 21st day of March, 1968.

3. Motion of Defendant for a Directed Verdict on Counts One, Two and Three, known as the Contract Counts, made at the close of Plaintiff's case, which written Motion was filed and made a part of the record in this cause on November 28, 1955, the motion to file said written Motion having been made and permission so thus to file granted by the Court as appears from Page 269 of the Typewritten Transcript herein;

4. Order of the Court overruling the last above-mentioned Motion for Directed Verdict, which Order appears on Page 271 of the Typewritten Transcript herein;

5. Motion of Defendant for a Directed Verdict, as to the Complaint herein and any and all Counts thereof, made at the close of all the evidence in this case, which written Motion was filed and made a part of the record in this cause on November 29, 1955, the motion to file said written Motion having been made and permission so thus to file granted by the Court as appears from Page 438 of the Typewritten Transcript herein;

6. Order of the Court overruling the last above-mentioned Motion for Directed Verdict, which Order appears on Page 438 of the Typewritten Transcript herein;

7. Motion of the Defendant for a Directed Verdict as to Counts One, Two and Three, known as the Contract Counts, made at the close of all the evidence in this case, which written Motion was filed and made a part of the record in this cause on November 29,

1955, the motion to file said written Motion having been made and permission so thus to file granted by the Court as appears from Page 438 of the Typewritten Transcript herein;

8. Order of the Court overruling the last above-mentioned Motion for Directed Verdict, which Order appears on Page 439 of the Typewritten Transcript herein;

9. All Exhibits admitted in evidence in this cause on behalf of Defendant, these Exhibits being received in evidence and marked with the following Exhibit numbers, and a summary description of each exhibit being set forth as follows:

Exhibit Number	Summary Description
D-1	List of cattle at Hilo Dairy.
D-2	Ledger account for cattle for Hilo Dairy.
D-3	Summary of cows purchased since July 1, 1946.
D-4	Letter of October 11, 1949, from Lyman Reed to F. G. Low of du Pont.
D-5	Photostatic copies of chemical safety data sheets and other printed matter.
D-6	Photostatic copy of underwriters laboratories card on cleaning liquid.
D-7	Photostatic copy of printed material on du Pont chlorinated hydrocarbons.
D-8	Letter from Magnolia Soy Products Company, by L. L. Ford, dated February 14, 1952, to Mr. C. B. Shepherd, du Pont.
D-9	Photostatic copy of an excerpt from "Feedstuffs", a weekly newspaper dated October 6, 1951.
D-10	Letter from C. B. Shepherd to Lyman Reed dated July 31, 1951.

Exhibit Number	Summary Description
D-11	Copy of original Order from Magnolia Soy Products Company to E. I. du Pont, the Order having been entered on October 2, 1951, and the invoice being dated November 21, 1951.
D-12	Factory shipping advice from du Pont to Magnolia Soy Products Company, shipping date shown as November 19, 1951.
D-13	An Acknowledgment of Order from du Pont to Magnolia Soy Products Company showing the Order entered October 2, 1951, front and reverse.
D-14 a	Copy of Uniform Straight Bill of Lading issued by Illinois Central Railroad Company showing car number IC-27893 was received for shipment in Greenville, Mississippi, on November 26, 1951.
D-14 b	Copy of Memorandum of Bill of Lading issued by Illinois Central Railroad Company showing that car number IC-27831 was received for shipment in Greenville, Mississippi, on November 26, 1951.
D-14 c	Copy of Uniform Straight Bill of Lading issued by Illinois Central Railroad Company showing car number IC-32008 was received for shipment in Greenville, Mississippi, on the 23rd day of November, 1951.
D-15 a	Copy of Memorandum of Bill of Lading issued by Illinois Central Railroad Company showing that car number NYC-178296 was received for shipment on the 26th day of November, 1951.
D-15 b	Copy of Memorandum of Bill of Lading issued by Illinois Central Railroad Company showing that car number SOU-22061 was received for shipment from Greenville, Mississippi, on December 8, 1951.

Exhibit Number	Summary Description
D-15 c	Shipping Order of Illinois Central Railroad Company showing that car number NH-33672 was received for shipment from Greenville, Mississippi, on December 10, 1951.
D-16	Request of the Court to take judicial notice of the law of the State of New York;

10. All colloquies between Counsel and between Court and Counsel, as appear from Page 439 to Page 463, both inclusive, of the Typewritten Transcript; and

11. This Counter-Designation.

(S.) EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas),

Office and Post Office Address:
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi.

CARL E. GEUTHER,
Attorneys for Appellee-Defendant.

Office and Post Office Address:
7098 Du Pont Building,
Wilmington, Delaware.

WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi,
Of Counsel.

Affidavit of Service.

State of Mississippi,
County of Hinds.

Earl T. Thomas, being by me first duly sworn, makes oath that he has served the above and foregoing Counter-Designation of Additional Portions of Record on Appeal on Counsel for the Plaintiffs by mailing this date, first class air mail, postage prepaid, true copies thereof, respectively, to the following Attorneys of Record for the Plaintiffs, at the following respective addresses thereof:

William G. Burgin, Jr., Esq.
516 North Second Avenue
Columbus, Mississippi
Roger E. Brooks, Esq.
923—20th Street, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.
Nils Tavares, Esq.
Messrs. Pratt, Tavares & Cassidy
Alexander & Baldwin Building
Honolulu, Hawaii
Shiro Kashiwa, Esq.
Messrs. Kashiwa & Kashiwa
Hawaiian Trust Building
Honolulu, Hawaii
David Ingman, Esq.,
Alexander Young Building
Honolulu, Hawaii;

their usual and respective post office addresses.

(S.) EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas).

Sworn to and subscribed before me, this the 28th day of May, 1956.

(S.) MILDRED LUSK,
(Seal) Notary Public.

My Commission Expires Jan. 31, 1960.

APPELLANTS' DESIGNATION AS TO PRINTING RECORD.

Filed June 6, 1956.

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership,

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Appellants,

vs. No. 16140.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Appellees.

The plaintiffs-appellants in the above-captioned causes hereby direct the Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit to print and include in the printed record on appeal in these causes all of those portions of the Trial Court record which are enumerated in and described below, to-wit:

1. Complaints filed December 9, 1953 in each of the above-captioned causes.

2. Answers to complaints filed January 14, 1954 in each of the above-captioned causes.

3. Motion of defendants for summary judgment.

4. Order denying motion for summary judgment.

5. Motion to consolidate the three actions.

6. Order granting motion to consolidate.

7. Stipulations entered of record.

8. Written instructions filed by plaintiffs.

9. Ruling of the Court denying request for allowance of plaintiffs' written instructions.

10. Exception to ruling of the Court denying plaintiffs' request for allowance of written instructions.

11. Verdict, together with the direction for the entry of judgment thereon.

12. Opinion.

13. Plaintiffs' motion for new trial.

14. Order entered February 2, 1956, denying plaintiffs' motion for new trial.

15. Judgment.

16. Notices of appeal filed.

17. Typewritten transcript of the opening statement of the Court to the jury and charge of the Court to the jury and of the testimony taken at the trial of these causes of the following-named witnesses:

For the plaintiffs—L. L. Ford and Dr. Raymond T. Vaughn;

For the defendant— R. Stuart Armstrong, C. B. Shepherd, and Frank McDonald.

18. Copy of designation of record on appeal on behalf of plaintiffs-appellants, dated May 21, 1956.

19. Statement of points on which appellants rely, filed May 21, 1956.

20. All exhibits offered in evidence by plaintiffs, the admission of which was refused.

Dated this 6th day of June, 1956.

PRATT, TAVARES & CASSIDY,
SHIRO KASHIWA,
INGMAN & INGMAN,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
WILLIAM G. BURGIN, JR.,
Attorneys for Plaintiffs-Appellants,
By WM. G. BURGIN, JR.,
(Wm. G. Burgin, Jr.).

516 Second Avenue North,
Columbus, Mississippi.

Certificate.

I, Wm. G. Burgin, Jr., of counsel for Plaintiffs, hereby certify that I have this day mailed a true copy of the foregoing Designation, postage prepaid, to Honorable Earl T. Thomas, Attorney, Lamar Life Building, Jackson, Mississippi and to Honorable Carl E. Guether Attorney, DuPont Building, Wilmington, Del., counsel for Defendant.

This the 6th day of June, 1956.

WM. G. BURGIN, JR.,
(Wm. G. Burgin, Jr).

JOINT STIPULATION AS TO PRINTING CERTAIN PORTIONS OF THE RECORD AS DESIGNATED BY APPELLEE.

Filed June 13, 1956

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a Co-Partnership; Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy; and Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Appellants,

v. No. 16,140.

E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Appellee.

To: Honorable John A Feehan, Jr., Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Cir-

cuit, and to the Printer Designated by him for the Purpose of Printing the Record:

It Is Hereby Stipulated by and between Wm. G. Burgin, Jr., Esq., of Counsel for the Appellants, and Earl T. Thomas, Esq., of Counsel for the Appellees, in the above and foregoing cause, that in order to save expense and duplication in printing, that as to the various Motions for a Directed Verdict made by Appellee, Defendant in the District Court, which Motions are referred to and set out in "Appellee's Designation of Portions of the Record to be Printed" filed in this Court on June 5, 1956, that the Clerk aforesaid may make the following notations on the various Motions referred to in said Designation, by pasting or otherwise of said notations on the respective Motions, said notations being for the direction and benefit of the printer in printing the record:

1.

As to the "Motion of Defendant for a Directed Verdict" as to the Complaint, and any and all counts thereof, made at the close of Plaintiff's case, paste or insert the following notation as to each of the three cases styled and numbered in the District Court in the manner below:

As to the Nishida Case.

(Civil Action No. 142, District Court).

Do Not Print.

(as Counsel for the parties dispense with the same by Stipulation.)

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

As to the Fred L. Waldron, Ltd. Case.

(Civil Action No. 143, District Court).

Do Not Print.

(as Counsel for the parties dispense with the same by Stipulation.

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

As to the Sokei Case.

(Civil Action No. 145, District Court).

("Caption omitted. Filed November 28, 1955. The following Motion was made in each of the three cases appealed from in identical language, except when the word 'Plaintiff' hereinafter appears, the applicable word in the Nishida case is 'Plaintiffs.')"

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

2.

As to the "Motion of Defendant for a Directed Verdict" on Counts One, Two and Three, known as the Contract Counts, made at the close of Plaintiff's case, paste or insert the following notation as to each of the three cases styled and numbered in the District Court in the manner below:

As to the Nishida Case.

(Civil Action No. 142, District Court).

Do Not Print.

(As Counsel for the parties dispense with the same by Stipulation.)

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

As to the Fred L. Waldron, Ltd. Case.

(Civil Action No. 143, District Court).

Do Not Print.

(as Counsel for the parties dispense with the same by Stipulation.)

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

As to the Sokei Case.

(Civil Action No. 145, District Court).

"(Caption omitted. Filed November 28, 1955. The following Motion was made in each of the three cases appealed from, in identical language, except when the word 'Plaintiff' hereinafter appears, the applicable word in the Nishida case is 'Plaintiffs', and except in the Waldron case, Paragraph 7 is entirely omitted.)"

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

3.

As to the "Motion of Defendant for a Directed Verdict", as to the Complaint and any and all Counts thereof, made at the close of all the evidence in the case, paste or insert the following notation as to each of the three cases styled and numbered in the District Court in the manner below:

As to the Nishida Case.

(Civil Action No. 142, District Court).

Do Not Print.

(as Counsel for the parties dispense with the same by Stipulation.)

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

As to the Fred L. Waldron, Ltd. Case.

(Civil Action No. 143, District Court).

Do Not Print.

(as Counsel for the parties dispense with the same by Stipulation.)

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

As to the Sokei Case.

(Civil Action No. 145, District Court).

"(Caption omitted. Filed November 29, 1955. The following Motion was made in each of the three cases appealed from, in identical language, except when the word 'Plaintiff' hereinafter appears, the applicable word in the Nishida case is 'Plaintiffs'.)"

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

4.

As to the "Motion of Defendant for a Directed Verdict", on Counts One, Two and Three, known as the Contract Counts, made at the close of all the evidence in the case, paste or insert the following notation as to each of the three cases styled and numbered in the District Court in the manner below:

As to the Nishida Case.

(Civil Action No. 142, District Court).

Do Not Print.

(as Counsel for the parties dispense with the same by Stipulation.)

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

As to the Fred L. Waldron, Ltd. Case

(Civil Action No. 143, District Court).

Do Not Print

(as Counsel for the parties dispense with the same by Stipulation.)

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

As to the Sokei Case

(Civil Action No. 145, District Court.)

"(Caption omitted. Filed November 29, 1955. The following Motion was made in each of the three cases appealed from, in identical language, except when the word 'Plaintiff' hereinafter appears, the applicable word in the Nishida case is 'Plaintiffs', and in the Waldron case, Paragraph 7 is entirely omitted."

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

Witness our signatures, this June 9, 1956.

(Signed) WM. G. BURGIN,
(Wm. G. Burgin),
Of Counsel for Appellants

Columbus, Mississippi.

EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas),
Of Counsel for Appellee

Jackson, Mississippi.

Validated, Authorized and Approved.

ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks),
Chief Counsel for Appellants.

COMPLAINT

Filed this 9 day of Dec. 1953.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as the Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

vs Civil Action No. 142

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, Defendant.

Count One.

1. The plaintiffs are and at all times mentioned in this complaint were residents of Kappa District of

the County of Kauai, Island of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii, and for many years prior to the date hereof, the plaintiffs were and are now engaged in the dairy business within the Territory of Hawaii, under the name and style of "Hilo Dairy Company" and are copartners duly registered pursuant to the laws of the said Territory; the copartnership was created in the year 1947 and ever since the two plaintiffs have been the sole and only partners.

2. The defendant is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its domicile and principal office in Wilmington, Delaware, and having qualified to do business and doing business in the State of Mississippi, and having appointed an agent for the service of process for suits in said state, to wit: R. H. Thompson, in Jackson, Hinds County, Mississippi, upon whom service of process may be had.

3. The matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of Three Thousand Dollars ($3,000.00), exclusive of interest and costs.

4. The jurisdiction of the Court is invoked under Section 1332, Title 28, U. S. Code, June 25, 1948, c. 646, 62 Stat. 930; and under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, Chapter 9, Title 21, U. S. Code, June 25, 1938, c. 675, 52 Stat. 1040.

5. During the year 1947 and continuously since that date the plaintiffs have been and are now engaged in the aforesaid dairy business in the County of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii, the said business consisting of raising, feeding and maintaining cows for the

purpose of milking said cows and selling the milk obtained throughout the County of Kauai.

6. On or about the end of 1951 and up to the time of the occurrence of the incidents hereinafter more particularly described, the plaintiffs owned and were using in their said business, about one hundred and one head of good dairy cows and the said business was a prosperous and profitable one with excellent good will and a large number of customers within the said County of Kauai.

7. During the latter part of the year 1951, the plaintiffs for a fixed consideration ordered for purchase from Fred L. Waldron, Limited, a corporation, incorporated under the laws of the Territory of Hawaii, with its principal office, at all times herein mentioned at 808 Fort Street, Honolulu, City and County of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, 300 sacks of soybean meal weighing 100 pounds each and the said Waldron, Limited, on receipt of said order of purchase agreed to accept it and in accordance with the agreement did sell and deliver to the plaintiffs the 200 sacks of soybean meal and the said meal was accepted by plaintiffs.

8. For many years prior and to the date of this complaint, the said Waldron, Limited, was extensively engaged in the business of buying and selling feeds of all kinds for cattle and during the said period in the course of its business sold a considerable amount of various cattle feed in the County of Kauai.

9. The plaintiffs for years prior and continuously during the year 1951 and including the time of the

occurrence of the transactions herein alleged, purchased from the said Waldron, Limited, cattle feed including soybean meal and in all of said purchases the plaintiffs relied exclusively on the skill and judgment of the said seller in selecting cattle feed, including soybean meal of good quality and fit for consumption by plaintiffs' cattle and the said Waldron, Limited, in all of the purchases aforementioned and during the stated period of time well knew all the facts alleged in paragraph 5 hereof and that any soybean meal purchased by plaintiffs was for the purpose of feeding it to plaintiffs' aforesaid dairy herd.

10. Upon delivery of the 300 sacks of soybean meal, as aforesaid, plaintiffs fed the said soybean meal to their aforesaid dairy herd and as a result of the consumption of the said meal 51 of plaintiffs' dairy cows died and the remainder of the herd became violently ill, the meal in said sacks contained poisonous and toxic matter which directly and proximately caused the deaths and violent illnesses aforesaid and required plaintiffs to employ veterinarians and additional labor to care for the said herd, and as a direct result of the deaths of the dairy cows and the violent illness of the remainder of plaintiffs' herd of cattle, plaintiffs have not been and will not be able to supply milk to many of their customers, have lost a large number of customers and the good will of their business with the consequent great loss of profits and they will continue to suffer great loss of profits.

11. The said Waldron, Limited, for a fixed consideration placed an order to purchase two hundred (200) tons of solvent soybean meal sacked in burlap bags with the Brode Corporation of Memphis, Ten-

nessee, and the purchase order was accepted by confirmation of sale of the said corporation dated October 30, 1951.

12. The said Brode Corporation for a fixed consideration placed an order of purchase for the meal described in paragraph numbered 11 hereof with the Magnolia Soy Products Company of Greenville, Mississippi, and the said Company accepted the order and as part thereof, did ship through interstate commerce to the said Waldron, at Port Allen, Hawaii, the said 300 sacks of soybean meal, extracted with trichloroethylene, sold and delivered by Waldron, Limited, as herein alleged to the plaintiffs with the resulting loss to the dairy herd of the plaintiffs aforementioned.

13. The said soybean meal, extracted with trichloroethylene, as manufactured by the said Magnolia Soy Products Company, was placed in the aforesaid 300 sacks by the said Company at its plant in Mississippi and it was received by the said Waldron at Port Allen, Hawaii, in the original sacks of the aforesaid, each sack having attached when received, the said Company's identification tag, and the said 300 sacks of meal, each with said Company's identification tag attached, were delivered as aforesaid by Waldron to the plaintiffs, each sack having been unopened from the time it was placed in shipment by the said Company until received by the plaintiffs and by them opened for the feeding of the contents to the aforesaid dairy herd by them owned.

14. The defendant was engaged, among other activities, in the manufacture, for sale and distribution

through interstate commerce, of certain chemical compounds and sold and shipped through interstate commerce to Magnolia Soy Products Company a chemical solvent, to wit, trichloroethylene, for use in extracting soybean oil from soybeans, then and there well knowing that the soybean meal from which the soybean oil was to be extracted by use of its product trichloroethylene was to be sold for cattle feed; the defendant at the time of making the sale of the aforesaid chemical solvent to Magnolia Soy Products Company then and there knew, or by the exercise of ordinary care could have known, that soybean meal which had the soybean oil extracted therefrom by the use of the said chemical solvent became unfit for and dangerous as food for cattle, and knew or by the exercise of ordinary care could have known that said solvent, if used for the purpose for which the defendant recommended, sold and delivered it to the Magnolia Soy Products Company for use by the Company in the manner which defendant knew it would be used, would cause the soybean meal to become poisonous to and unfit as food for cattle.

15. The defendant well knew, or should have known, that soybean meal when processed with its manufactured product trichloroethylene, for sale and delivery through interstate commerce for feed for cattle was toxic and poisonous and would when fed to cattle, including the cattle of the plaintiffs, result in great and serious damage and the defendant through the sale and delivery of the said solvent for the aforesaid purpose then and there breached its implied warranty that soybean meal so manufactured would be fit and wholesome food for consumption by plaintiffs' said dairy herd; the implied warranty was

a material part and condition of the sale transaction and plaintiffs relied on said warranty.

16. By reason of said breach of implied warranty, plaintiffs have suffered great damage; the damages hereinafter claimed and alleged are damages for losses directly and proximately and naturally resulting in the ordinary course of events from the breach of warranty aforealleged by the defendant; at the time of the sale and delivery aforealleged defendant well knew, or should have known, that all of the losses hereinafter set forth would directly and proximately result from the said sale and delivery of poisonous and toxic soybean meal; the poisonous and toxic condition of the said meal resulting directly from the use in its processing and manufacturing of trichloroethylene manufactured, sold and delivered by the defendant to the Magnolia Soy Products Company; all losses for which damages are hereinafter claimed were all reasonably foreseeable.

17. By reason of the aforesaid breach of implied warranty, plaintiffs suffered the following specific and special damages: From the death of 51 good high quality milking cows as aforesaid, $40,000.00; from the violent illness of the remainder of the dairy herd, i. e., 50 high quality milking cows as aforealleged, $20,000.00; from, as alleged herein, the inability of the plaintiffs to supply milk, because of the reduction in the dairy herd through the aforesaid deaths and violent illnesses, resulting in loss of a large number of customers and the good will of the business, $20,000.00; from the great loss of profits suffered and the loss of profits which will be suffered, $30,000.00; by reason of required services of veteri-

narians and of additional labor arising solely out of the aforesaid deaths and illnesses of the dairy cows, $4,990.00.

18. The plaintiffs further claim as general damages, $30,000.00. The total of plaintiffs' damages, special and general, is $147,790.00.

19. Prior to the filing of this complaint plaintiffs requested and demanded of defendant payment of damages as aforesaid but defendant has paid no part thereof and refuses to pay the damages or any part thereof and there is now due and owing to the plaintiffs from the defendant the total sum of $147,790.00 by reason of the breach of the aforesaid warranty.

Count Two.

1. Plaintiffs reiterate and reallege all of the allegations in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of Count One hereof.

2. The defendant at the time of the aforementioned sale of and delivery of its manufactured product, the solvent trichloroethylene, to Magnolia Soy Products Company, knowing that the said Company would use the said solvent in extracting oil from soybeans and that the residual meal, including the aforesaid 300 sacks of meal sold and shipped in interstate commerce to the said Waldron, Limited, at Port Allen, Hawaii, and by the said Waldron sold and delivered to the plaintiffs for feed for their cattle, impliedly warranted to all purchasers including the plaintiffs that the contents of the aforesaid 300 sacks of soy bean meal were of merchantable quality; the implied

warranty was a material part and condition of the sale transaction and plaintiffs relied on said warranty, and the defendant well knew, or should have known, that the soybean meal manufactured through the use of the solvent trichloroethylene, for sale and delivery through interstate commerce to the general public and to Fred L. Waldron, Limited, for sale by the latter, within the said Territory for feed for cattle, including the cattle of the plaintiffs, was toxic and poisonous and would when fed to cattle result in great and serious damage and the defendant at the time of the aforesaid sale and delivery to the said Waldron then and there breached its implied warranty of the merchantable quality of the said soybean meal to the great damage to the plaintiffs.

3. The damages set out and claimed in paragraphs 17 and 18 of Count One hereof are damages for losses directly and proximately and naturally resulting in the ordinary course of events from the breach by defendant of the aforesaid warranty of merchantable quality and were all reasonably foreseeable by the defendant.

4. Plaintiffs reiterate and reallege all of the allegations in paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 of Count One hereof, and demand payment of the damages set out in said paragraphs 17 and 18 by reason of the aforesaid breach of the defendant's implied warranty of merchantable quality.

Count Three.

1. Plaintiffs reiterate and reallege all of the allegations in paragraph 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of Count One hereof.

2. The defendant at the time of the aforementioned sale and at the time of the said soybean meal was placed in the said 300 sacks by Magnolia Soy Products Company at its plant at Greenville, Mississippi, for shipment in interstate commerce to Waldron at Port Allen, Hawaii, expressly warranted to all purchasers including the plaintiffs that the contents of the aforementioned 300 sacks of soybean meal were of merchantable quality and fit for consumption by cattle and the express warrant was a material part and condition of the sale transaction and plaintiffs relied on said warranty, and the defendant well knew, or should have known, that the soybean meal manufactured and processed through the use of its product the solvent, trichloroethylene, for sale and delivery through interstate commerce to Fred L. Waldron, Limited, for sale within the Territory of Hawaii, for feed for cattle, including the cattle of plaintiffs, was toxic and poisonous and would when fed to cattle result in great and serious damage and the defendant at the time of the aforesaid sale and delivery to the said Waldron then and there breached its express warranty of the merchantable quality and fitness for consumption by cattle of the said soybean meal to the great damage of the plaintiffs.

3. The damages set out and claimed in paragraphs 17 and 18 of Count One hereof are damages for losses directly and proximately and naturally resulting in the ordinary course of events from the breach by defendant of the aforesaid express warranty of merchantable quality and fitness for consumption by cattle and were all reasonably foreseeable by the defendant.

4. Plaintiffs reiterate and reallege all of the allegations in paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 of Count One hereof and demand payment of the damages set forth in said paragraphs 17 and 18 by reason of the aforesaid breach of the defendant's express warranty of merchantable quality and fitness for consumption.

Count Four.

1. Plaintiffs reiterate and reallege all of the allegations in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 of Count One hereof.

2. That at all times mentioned herein the laws of the Territory of Hawaii, as material herein, provided as follows:

"Chapter 41. Food, Drugs and Cosmetics.
Sec. 2201. Definitions. For the purposes of this part:

(d) 'Food' means articles used for food or drink for man or animals. . . (3) articles used for components of any such article. . .

Sec. 2206. Prohibited acts. The following acts and the causing thereof within the Territory by any person are hereby prohibited: (a) The manufacture, sale, or delivery, holding or offering for sale of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded. . . (d) The receipt in commerce of any food, drug, device or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded, and the delivery or proffered delivery thereof for pay or otherwise. . ."

Sec. 2209. Foods deemed to be adulterated when. A food shall be deemed to be adulterated: (a) (1) If it bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render it injurious to health; but in case the substance is not an added substance such food shall not be considered adulterated under this clause if the quantity of such substance in such food does not ordinarily render it injurious to health; or (2) if it bears or contains any added poisonous or added deleterious substance which is unsafe within the meaning of section 2213; or (3) if it consists in whole or in part of a diseased, contaminated, filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance, or if it is otherwise unfit for food; or (4) if it has been produced, prepared, packed, or held under insanitary conditions whereby it may have become contaminated with filth, or whereby it may have been rendered diseased, unwholesome or injurious to health; . . .

3. That at all times mentioned herein the laws of the United States, as material herein, provided as follows:

Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (Vol. 5, FCA, Title 21).

"Sec. 321. Definitions; generally

(f) the term 'food' means (1) articles used for food or drink for man or other animals. . . (3) articles used for components of any such article.

"Sec. 331. Prohibited acts.

The following acts and the causing thereof are hereby prohibited:

(a) The introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded.

(b) The adulteration or misbranding of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic in interstate commerce.

(c) The receipt in interstate commerce of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded, and the delivery or proffered delivery thereof for pay or otherwise. . . ."

That the definition of adulterated food is the same as that recited above with relation to the laws of the Territory of Hawaii.

4. On or about December 1, 1951, plaintiffs for a fixed consideration ordered for purchase from Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Honolulu, Hawaii, 300 sacks of soybean meal to be used for feed for their cattle in this complaint described, the said Waldron, Limited, ordered for a fixed consideration said meal from The Brode Corporation of Memphis, Tennessee, and The Brode Corporation for a fixed consideration ordered for purchase, as set forth and alleged in paragraphs 11 and 12 of Count One hereof, the said soybean meal from the Magnolia Soy Products Company, Greenville, Mississippi.

5. The said Magnolia Soy Products Company accepted the said order and manufactured, packed, sold, shipped in interstate commerce and delivered the said 300 sacks of meal of 100 pounds each, to the said Waldron, Limited, at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, for sale by the said Waldron to the plaintiffs for feed for their cattle.

6. The defendant was engaged, among other activities, in the manufacture, for sale and distribution through interstate commerce, of certain chemical compounds and sold and shipped through interstate commerce to Magnolia Soy Products Company a chemical solvent to wit: trichloroethylene, for use in extracting soybean oil from soybeans, then and there well knowing that the soybean meal, from which the soybean oil was to be extracted by use of its product trichloroethylene was to be sold for cattle feed; the defendant at the time of making the sale of the aforesaid chemical solvent to Magnolia Soy Products Company then and there knew, or by the exercise of ordinary care could have known, that soybean meal which had the soybean oil extracted therefrom by the use of the said chemical solvent became unfit for and dangerous as food for cattle, and knew, or by the exercise of ordinary care could have known, that said solvent, if used for the purpose for which the defendant recommended, sold and delivered it to the Magnolia Soy Products Company for use by the Company in the manner which defendant knew it would be used, would cause the soybean meal to become poisonous to and unfit as food for cattle; the defendant knew that the chemical solvent, trichloroethylene, had caused death and injury to cattle when used for the aforesaid purpose at numerous previous times and would in this instance.

7. The defendant, at the time of the sale of the chemical solvent and the delivery through interstate commerce to Magnolia Soy Products Company or at any time thereafter, failed and neglected to inform the said Company, the plaintiffs or the general public that the aforesaid chemical solvent when used to ex-

tract soybean oil made the residual soybean meal poisonous and injurious to and unfit and unsound as food for cattle, the defendant owed a duty to do so and the failure to perform this duty constituted negligence.

8. The defendant recommended the use of and sold and distributed trichloroethylene through interstate commerce as a solvent to remove soybean oil from soybean meal, knowing that the residual meal was to be used as cattle food, knowing, or the defendant should have known, at the time of the sale and delivery of the trichloroethylene to Magnolia Soy Products Company that the Company would process, manufacture, market and distribute, through interstate commerce, to the general public the residual meal for use as cattle food and the said Company did manufacture, sell and distribute to the general public, including the plaintiffs, soybean meal so processed with the aforesaid solvent the defendant having knowledge or imputed knowledge of the dangerous qualities of the solvent trichloroethylene.

9. The defendant having knowledge or being chargeable with knowledge, of the use to be made by the Magnolia Soy Products Company of the defendant's product trichloroethylene, the sale and distribution through interstate commerce of the residual meal and the danger to cattle of the meal when so processed as food for cattle, a duty arose on the part of the defendant to perform and carry out such test as would make certain that the aforesaid soybean meal would not be unfit, unsound and injurious to cattle when fed to them. This duty the defendant failed to perform, thus the defendant is guilty of negligence.

10. The aforesaid negligence of the defendant up to the time of the injury to the plaintiffs directly and proximately caused the death and destruction of the plaintiffs' dairy cattle, and all of the other injuries to plaintiffs as herein specifically and generally set out.

11. The soybean meal, the contents of the said 300 sacks, was processed or manufactured through and by the use of the solvent trichloroethylene, a product or chemical manufactured by and sold and delivered through interstate commerce by the defendant to the said Magnolia Soy Products Company, the said soybean meal so manufactured was highly toxic and poisonous and when fed after delivery as aforesaid, to plaintiffs' herd of dairy cows caused 51 of them to die and the remainder, consisting of 50 cows, to become seriously ill.

12. The defendant, the manufacturer of the chemical, trichloroethylene, knew or should have known that the trichloroethylene would be used for the stated purpose by the said Magnolia Soy Products Company, knew or should have known that the soybean meal resulting from the use of the said chemical would be sold and delivered through interstate commerce for feed for cattle, and knew or should have known that the residual meal so processed was toxic and poisonous and would when fed to cattle cause serious illness and death to the cattle, notwithstanding such knowledge or imputed knowledge, the defendant carelessly and negligently manufactured and delivered as aforesaid the said chemical; thereby and by reason thereof the death and illness of the cattle and all and every injury of the plaintiffs as set out in this complaint were directly and proximately caused by the sale

and use of the said trichloroethylene in the processing of soybeans, resulting in the said poisonous and toxic meal.

13. There was a duty on the part of the defendant under the conditions and circumstances aforealleged to use reasonable care not to ship and deliver through interstate commerce the said trichloroethylene for use in the manufacture of soybean meal for feed for cattle, including the aforesaid cattle of the plaintiffs; the failure of the defendant to exercise due care constituted negligence.

14. Plaintiffs reiterate and reallege all of the allegations in paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 of Count One hereof.

15. By reason of said negligence the plaintiffs suffered great damage; the damages claimed are set out in paragraphs 17 and 18 of Count One hereof and are damages for losses directly and proximately and naturally resulting in the ordinary course of events from the negligence of the defendant as aforesaid, in that defendant well knew, or should have known, at the time of the said delivery of the aforesaid meal that it would be from the use of the defendant's manufactured chemical trichloroethylene poisonous and toxic; that all of the losses aforesaid would directly and proximately result, for all of the losses for which damages are claimed as aforealleged were reasonably foreseeable by the defendant.

16. The transaction upon which this cause of action is based is the same transaction alleged in Counts One, Two and Three of this complaint.

Wherefore, the plaintiffs demand judgment against the defendant in the sum of One Hundred Forty Seven Thousand Seven Hundred and Ninety Dollars ($147,-790.00).

SHIRO KASHIWA,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks),
Attorneys for Plaintiffs.

923—20th Street, N. W.,
Washington, D. C.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL.

The plaintiffs demand a trial by jury on all issues.

SHIRO KASHIWA,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks),
Attorneys for Plaintiffs.

ANSWER OF E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & COMPANY, DEFENDANT.

Filed this 14 day of Jan. 1954.

United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as the Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, Defendant.

Now comes E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, (hereinafter, for the sake of brevity, sometimes referred to variously as "Defendant," "this Defendant" or "du Pont"), the Defendant in the above entitled and numbered action, and files this, its Answer to the Complaint herein.

Answer to Count One.

First Defense.

Count One of the Complaint fails to state a claim against this Defendant upon which relief can be granted.

Second Defense.

Now responding to, and following the same numbering of paragraphs of, Count One of the Complaint, Defendant answers and says:

1.

Defendant alleges that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 1 of Count One of the Complaint, and, therefore, the allegations of said paragraph of Count One are denied.

2 and 3.

Defendant admits the allegations contained in paragraphs 2 and 3 of said Count One of the Complaint.

4.

Defendant admits that Plaintiffs claim and invoke jurisdiction of this Court under the code sections and Acts of Congress referred to in paragraph 4 of Count One of the Complaint, but Defendant denies that this Honorable Court has jurisdiction of either the subject matter or the parties.

5-13, inclusive.

Defendant alleges that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 of Count One of the Complaint, and, therefore, each and every allegation contained in all of said paragraphs in Count One of the Complaint are denied.

14.

Defendant denies each and every allegation of paragraph 14 of Count One of the Complaint, except De-

fendant admits that it was engaged, among other activities, in the manufacture for sale and distribution through interstate commerce, of certain chemical compounds and sold and shipped through interstate commerce, to Magnolia Soy Products Company, a chemical solvent, to-wit: trichloroethylene, for use in extracting soybean oil from soybeans.

15 and 16.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 15 and 16 of Count One of the Complaint.

17 and 18.

For answer to paragraphs 17 and 18 of Count One of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraphs 17 and 18 of said Count One, as to the loss of high quality milking cows, losses of milk profits (past, present or prospective), losses of customers and good-will, expenses incurred by the use of veterinarians, and the employment of labor incident to the alleged death and illness of dairy cows, and further general damages, and therefore, all allegations of Plaintiffs in said paragraphs 17 and 18 are denied.

Defendant denies that any and all such alleged losses referred to in paragraphs 17 and 18 of Count One were the result of any negligence of the Defendant, or any act, or failure to act, or violation of any duty, by the Defendant.

19.

Defendant admits that Plaintiffs have made demand upon it prior to the filing of this Complaint for payment of $120,790.00, and admits that Defendant has paid no part thereof and that Defendant has refused to pay said sum or any part thereof; but Defendant denies each and every other allegation contained in said paragraph 19 of Count One of the Complaint.

Answer to Count Two.

First Defense.

Count Two fails to state a claim against this Defendant upon which relief can be granted.

Second Defense.

Now responding to, and following the same numbering of paragraphs of, Count Two of the Complaint, Defendant answers and says:

1.

Defendant, for its answer to paragraph 1 of Count Two of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates and adopts its answers to paragraphs 1 to 14, both inclusive, of Count One of the Complaint.

2 and 3.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 2 and 3 of Count Two of the Complaint.

4.

Defendant, for its answer to paragraph 4 of said Count Two of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates and adopts its answer to paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 of Count One of the Complaint, and denies the remainder of said paragraph 4 of Count Two of the Complaint.

Answer to Count Three.

First Defense.

Count Three of the Complaint fails to state a claim against this Defendant upon which relief can be granted.

Second Defense.

Now responding to, and following the same numbering of paragraphs of, Count Three of the Complaint, Defendant answers and says:

1.

Defendant, for its answer to paragraph 1 of Count Three of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates and adopts its answers to paragraphs 1 to 14, both inclusive, of Count One of the Complaint.

2 and 3.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 2 and 3 of Count Three of the Complaint.

4.

Defendant, for its answer to paragraph 4 of Count Three of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates and adopts its answers to paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 of Count One of the Complaint, and denies the remainder of paragraph 4 of Count Three of the Complaint.

Answer to Count Four.

First Defense.

Count Four of the Complaint fails to state a claim against this Defendant upon which relief can be granted.

Second Defense.

Now responding to, and following the same numbering of paragraphs of, Count Four of the Complaint, Defendant answers and says:

1.

Defendant, for its answer to paragraph 1 of Count Four of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates and adopts its answers to paragraphs 1 to 13, both inclusive, of Count One of the Complaint.

2 and 3.

Inasmuch as paragraphs 2 and 3 of Count Four of the Complaint allege the existence, not of facts but of statutory law of the Territory of Hawaii and the United States, no answer thereto is required.

4 and 5.

Defendant alleges that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 4 and 5 of Count Four of the Complaint, and, therefore, the allegations in said paragraphs 4 and 5 of the said Count are denied.

6.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 6 of Count Four of the Complaint except Defendant admits that it was engaged, among other activities in the manufacture, for sale and distribution through interstate commerce, of certain chemical compounds and sold and shipped through interstate commerce to Magnolia Soy Products Company, a chemical solvent, to-wit: trichloroethylene, for use in extracting soybean oil from soybeans.

7.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 7 of Count Four of the Complaint.

8.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 8 of Count Four of the Complaint.

9 and 10.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 9 and 10 of Count Four of the Complaint.

11.

Defendant alleges that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 11 of Count Four of the Complaint, and, therefore, all allegations of the Plaintiffs in said paragraph 11 of Count Four of the Complaint are denied.

12.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 12 of Count Four of the Complaint.

13.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 13 of Count Four of the Complaint. It is further specifically denied that any negligence of Defendant (which negligence is denied) was in any way related to or connected with any damage to Plaintiffs and denies that Defendant violated, or failed to perform, any duty owed to the Plaintiffs.

14.

Defendant, for answer to paragraph 14 of Count Four of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates and adopts its answers to paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 of Count One of the Complaint

15.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 15 of Count Four of the Complaint.

16.

While this paragraph is nothing more than the conclusion of the pleader to which no answer is required, nevertheless, insofar as the same might be deemed proper pleading, the allegations of said paragraph 16 of Count Four of the Complaint are denied

Third Defense

For a third and further defense to the Complaint herein, and to each of the four Counts therein, Defendant alleges that this Court lacks jurisdiction over the person of this Defendant in that this Defendant is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware and was not and is not subject to service of process within the Northern District of Mississippi

Fourth Defense

For a fourth and further defense to the Complaint herein, and to each of the four Counts therein, Defendant alleges that this Court lacks jurisdiction of the subject matter in that the Plaintiffs are residents and citizens of the Territory of Hawaii and Defendant is a citizen and resident of the State of Delaware, under the laws of which it was and is organized and wherein it has its domicile, the said Defendant not being subject to service of process in the Northern District of Mississippi, and no alleged cause of action accrued unto Plaintiffs in the Northern District of Mississippi, and no act or omission of this Defendant is alleged to have occurred or been made in the Northern District of Mississippi

Fifth Defense.

For a fifth and further defense to the Complaint herein, and to each of the four Counts therein, Defendant alleges that the venue of this action does not lie in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, or the Greenville Division therein, but, on the contrary, venue lies, if the suit is maintainable at all, in the United States District Court for the Jackson Division of the Southern District of Mississippi.

And now having answered the Complaint, and each and every Count therein, Defendant prays to be dismissed with costs.

W. C. WELLS, III,
EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas),
Attorneys for Defendant.

Address of each of above:
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi.
CARL E. GEUTHER,
7058 Du Pont Building,
Wilmington, Delaware.
WALTER D. FORD,
7055-A Du Pont Building,
Wilmington, Delaware.
WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson Mississippi.
Of Counsel.

Affidavit of Service.

State of Mississippi,
County of Hinds.

Earl T. Thomas, being by me first duly sworn, states on oath that he has served the foregoing Answer on Counsel for Plaintiffs, by mailing this date, postage prepaid, true copies thereof respectively, to Shiro Kashiwa and Roger E. Brooks, Esqs., 923-20th Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. and Wm. G. Burgin, Jr., Esq., Columbus, Mississippi, Attorneys for the Plaintiffs.

EARL T. THOMAS.
(Earl T. Thomas).

Sworn to and subscribed before me, this January 13th, 1954.

JEWELL BEARD.
(Seal) Notary Public.

My Commission Expires Nov. 4, 1955.

MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANT.

Filed this 9 day of Oct. 1954.

United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as the Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, Defendant.

To the Honorable Judge of the Above Court:

Defendant moves the Court as follows:

1. That it enter, pursuant to Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a summary judgment in defendant's favor dismissing the action, on the ground that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact, and that defendant is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law.

This motion is based upon:

(a) The Complaint

(b) Affidavits, attached hereto, of:

(1) Clark B. Shepherd

(2) R. Stuart Armstrong, with attachments.

(3) Charles A. Kline, Jr.
W. C. WELLS, III,
EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas),
Attorneys for Defendant.

Address of each of above:
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi.
CARL E. GEUTHER,
7100 Du Pont Building,
Wilmington, Delaware.
WALTER D. FORD,
7055-A Du Pont Building,
Wilmington, Delaware.
WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi,
Of Counsel.

NOTICE OF MOTION

To: Roger E. Brooks, Esq.,
923—20th Street, N. W.,
Washington, D. C.
Shiro Kashiwa, Esq.,
Hawaiian Trust Building,
Honolulu, T. H.
Wm. G. Burgin, Jr., Esq.,
Columbus, Mississippi.
Attorneys for the Plaintiffs:

Please take notice, that the undersigned will bring the above Motion on for hearing before this Court.

Honorable Allen Cox, Presiding, in the Courtroom, United States Court House, Post Office Building, Oxford, Mississippi, on the 17th day of November, A. D. 1954, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon of that day or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard.

EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas),
Attorney for Defendant.

Address:
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi.
CARL E. GEUTHER,
7100 Du Pont Building,
Wilmington, Delaware.
WALTER D. FORD,
7055-A Du Pont Building,
Wilmington, Delaware.
WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi,
Of Counsel for Defendant.

Affidavit of Service.

State of Mississippi,
County of Hinds.

Earl T. Thomas, being by me first duly sworn, states on oath that he has served the foregoing Motion for Summary Judgment on behalf of Defendant and Notice of Motion on Counsel for Plaintiffs by mailing this date, postage prepaid, true copies thereof, respectively, to Roger E. Brooks, Esq., 923—20th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C., Shiro Kashiwa, Esq., Hawaiian Trust Building, Honolulu, T. H., and

Wm. G. Burgin, Jr., Esq., Columbus, Mississippi, Attorneys for the Plaintiff.

EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas).

Sworn to and subscribed before me, this the 8th day of October, A. D. 1954.

JOE JACK HURST,
(Seal) Notary Public in and for
Hinds County, Mississippi.

My Commission Expires Jan. 14, 1958.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Affidavit of Clark B. Shepherd.

State of Delaware,
County of New Castle. ss.

Clark B. Shepherd, being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says: that he is employed by the defendant, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, in the capacity of Manager of the Chlorine Products Division of the Electrochemicals Department and in such capacity is fully conversant and familiar with sales of trichlorethylene made by the Company, and the matters hereinafter deposed to: that he has held

such position since 1947 and was actively engaged in the selling of certain chemical products, including trichloretnylene, during 1951 and 1952; that his department was and is the only department of the defendant E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company engaged in the manufacture and/or sale of trichlorethylene which is the sole chemical product mentioned or complained of by plaintiffs; that at no time during said years was the defendant E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company engaged in the manufacture, offering for sale, or sale of soybean oil meal for any purpose; that no soybean oil meal was ever sold directly, indirectly or otherwise, by said defendant E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company to the plaintiffs, George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as the Hilo Dairy; that at no time, and with particular reference to 1951 and 1952, was any trichlorethylene sold to said plaintiffs by the said defendant E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company; that no contractual relations were set up, maintained or developed between his department of the defendant E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company and plaintiffs, and that no contact of any kind existed or took place between his department and the plaintiffs; that no representations were made by the defendant E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company to the plaintiffs as to the merchantability, suitability, fitness for particular purpose or of any other kind with respect to soybean oil meal or any products of his department and especially trichlorethylene; that the plaintiffs, or either of them, did not rely and could not have relied upon any representation, statement, act or warranty by representatives of his department with respect to soybean oil meal, trichlorethylene or other products.

That prior to July, 1951, trichlorethylene was offered for sale and sold by his department for multiple purposes, including the prepration of soybean oil meal for cattle feed; that on July 31, 1951 he prepared a letter addressed to, inter alia, the Magnolia Soy Products Company at Greenville, Mississippi, (and all other known soybean meal processors using the chemical product trichlorethylene purchased from E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company) in the following words:

"July 31, 1951

Mr. Lyman Reed, Sales Manager
Magnolia Soy Products Company
Greenville, Mississippi

Dear Mr. Reed:

In recent months, there have been increasing indications that trichlorethylene-extracted soybean meal may be associated with a hemorrhagic disease in cattle which has been observed in widely-scattered areas. Research programs are now being undertaken by the University of Minnesota and Iowa State College to investigate the nature and causes of the disease and to determine if trichlorethylene-extracted meal is, in fact, a contributory factor.

The cause of the disease is unknown. The evidence that trichlorethylene-extracted meal is associated in any way with the disease is entirely circumstantial, but the most recent reports have all come from farms using this type of meal in their cattle feed. Thus, despite the satisfactory experience with trichlorethylene-extracted meal in the past, we cannot ignore the possibility that this meal under certain conditions, perhaps in combination with one or more other factors, may be associated with the particular hemor-

rhagic disease observed in Minnesota and other scattered points.

In view of the present uncertainty, we strongly recommend that sales of trichlorethylene-extracted meal be confined to outlets other than cattle feed until more definite information is available from the investigations now underway in Minnesota and Iowa. To the best of our knowledge, the hemorrhagic disease in question is peculiar to cattle only, and all the available evidence and experience indicates that trichlorethylene-extracted meal is entirely satisfactory as a component for feeding hogs and poultry.

Very truly yours,

(S.) C. B. SHEPHERD,

(C. B. Shepherd),

Manager, Chlorine Products Division".

CBS/a

That the said letter was delivered pursuant his instructions by R. Stuart Armstrong, an employee of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company under his supervision to said Magnolia Soy Products Company on August 3, 1951 and that thereafter no sales of trichlorethylene were made to the said Magnolia Soy Products Company or any other purchaser for the purpose of manufacturing or processing soybean oil meal for cattle feed; that while he has no personal knowledge of the alleged purchases by the plaintiffs of soybean oil meal from others, he is advised that they are alleged to have been made from divers other parties during October, November, December of 1951 and January and February of 1952, at which time the said defendant E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company had long since desisted from any sales of trich-

lorethylene for the purpose of processing such soybean oil meal for cattle feed purposes.

CLARK B. SHEPHERD,
(Clark B. Shepherd).

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21st day of September A. D. 1954.

MILDRED V. KERSHAW,
(Seal) Notary Public in and for the County of New Castle, State of Delaware.

My commission expires Feb. 5, 1955.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi.

Affidavit of R. Stuart Armstrong.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as the Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a copartnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, Defendant.

State of Delaware,
County of New Castle. ss.

R. Stuart Armstrong, being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says: that he is employed by the defendant, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company in the Electrochemicals Department and that he is fully conversant and familiar with the matters hereinafter deposed to; that during the years 1951 and 1952

he was under the supervision of Clark B. Shepherd in the Chlorine Products Division of that Department in the capacity of a technical sales representative; that acting under the instructions of his superior, Clark B. Shepherd, he personally delivered to the Magnolia Soy Products Company at Greenville, Mississippi, and to all other known soybean processors using the chemical product trichlorethylene, which had been purchased from E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, a letter bearing date July 31, 1951, and over the signature of the said Clark B. Shepherd; that the said letter addressed to Magnolia Soy Products Company was delivered by him to that company at Greenville, Mississippi, on August 3, 1951, and was handed personally to L. L. Ford, Vice-President, and Lyman Reed, Secretary and Sales Manager, at the company offices therein situate; that the letter is as follows:

"July 31, 1951

Mr. Lyman Reed, Sales Manager
Magnolia Soy Products Company
Greenville, Mississippi

Dear Mr. Reed:

In recent months, there have been increasing indications that trichloroethylene-extracted soybean meal may be associated with a hemorrhagic disease in cattle which has been observed in widely-scattered areas. Research programs are now being undertaken by the University of Minnesota and Iowa State College to investigate the nature and causes of the disease and to determine if trichloroethylene-extracted meal is, in fact, a contributory factor.

The cause of the disease is unknown. The evidence that trichloroethylene-extracted meal is associated in

any way with the disease is entirely circumstantial, but the most recent reports have all come from farms using this type of meal in their cattle feed. Thus, despite the satisfactory experience with trichloroethylene-extracted meal in the past, we cannot ignore the possibility that this meal under certain conditions, perhaps in combination with one or more other factors, may be associated with the particular hemorrhagic disease observed in Minnesota and other scattered points.

In view of the present uncertainty, we strongly recommend that sales of trichloroethylene-extracted meal be confined to outlets other than cattle feed until more definite information is available from the investigations now underway in Minnesota and Iowa. To the best of our knowledge, the hemorrhagic disease in question is peculiar to cattle only, and all the available evidence and experience indicates that trichloroethylene-extracted meal is entirely satisfactory as a component for feeding hogs and poultry.

Very truly yours,

(S.) C. B. SHEPHERD,

(C. B. Shepherd),

Manager, Chlorine Products Division".

CBS/a

that deponent was a witness who testified in that certain case of E. I. Du Pont de Nemours v. Frank Lander (Case No. 39,116 of the Supreme Court of Mississippi) the opinion of which is reported in 73 So. (2nd) 249 (Vol. 2 of Advanced Sheets of July 15, 1954 for Vol. 73 (2nd) of Southern Reporter), a certified copy of which is attached hereto and marked Exhibit "A", during the trial of which there was in-

troduced into evidence the original of said letter so then delivered by affiant to said Magnolia Soy Products Company, which letter appears as "Exhibit G-21 Deft. Test. S. Armstrong" on page 467 of the Record on appeal, a certified copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "B" and made a part hereof.

R. STUART ARMSTRONG,
(R. Stuart Armstrong).

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21st day of September, 1954.

MILDRED V. KERSHAW,
(Seal) Notary Public in and for the State and County aforesaid.

My commission expires Feb. 5, 1955.

EX. A.

In the Supreme Court of Mississippi.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company,
vs. No. 39,116.
Frank Ladner.

Kyle, Justice:

Frank Ladner, as plaintiff, recovered a judgment in the Circuit Court of Pearl River County against E. I. Du Pont de Nemours and Company, defendant, for the sum of $1,793; and from that judgment the defendant prosecutes this appeal.

The declaration was filed by the plaintiff on July 25, 1952, against Magnolia Soy Products Company, a

corporation domiciled at Greenville, Mississippi, and E. I. Du Pont de Nemours and Company, a Delaware Corporation, as defendants. The plaintiff alleged in his declaration that during the month of December 1951 he purchased from L. J. Thigpen, a retail merchant, engaged in the business of selling cattle feed in the Town of Poplarville, several sacks of soybean meal to be used in feeding the plaintiff's dairy cattle; that he fed the meal to his dairy cattle, and that five of his cows sickened and died as a result of eating the meal. One other cow became sick, and her value as a milch cow was destroyed. The plaintiff alleged that the meal had been processed by the Magnolia Company, which owned and operated a plant at Greenville, and that Magnolia had used in the processing of the meal a chemical compound known as trichloroethylene, a compound manufactured and sold by the defendant Du Pont for use by manufacturers of soybean meal as a solvent in extracting oil from the soybeans. The plaintiff alleged that the processing of soybean meal by the use of trichloroethylene rendered the meal poisonous and unfit for cattle feed; that both Magnolia and Du Pont knew, or by the exercise of reasonable care should have known, that the processing of soybean meal by the use of trichloroethylene as a solvent would make the meal unfit for use as cattle feed; that Du Pont had recommended and sold the chemical to Magnolia as a solvent to be used in the manufacture of soybean meal, knowing that the meal was to be used as food for cattle; that both defendants had breached their duties to the plaintiff and were guilty of negligence which proximately caused the death of the plaintiff's cattle.

Before the case was tried Magnolia effected a settlement of its liability for the sum of $675, and the plaintiff dismissed his suit against Magnolia

In his declaration the plaintiff alleged that the defendant Du Pont owed to the plaintiff as a purchaser of soybean meal manufactured by Magnolia by the use of trichloroethylene the duty to inform the plaintiff, Magnolia, or the general public of the fact that trichloroethylene, when used as a processing agent for the manufacture of soybean meal, rendered the meal poisonous and unfit for use as food for cattle, and the duty not to introduce said chemical compound and offer the same for sale in interstate commerce for use as a solvent in the manufacture of soybean meal to be fed to cattle.

The defendant Du Pont in its answer admitted that it was engaged in the business of manufacturing and selling trichloroethylene, and that it had sold said product in interstate commerce to Magnolia to be used in extracting soybean oil from soybeans; but the defendant denied the other allegations of the plaintiff's declaration, and averred that the declaration failed to state a claim against the defendant upon which relief could be granted.

Ladner testified that he owned about 40 head of cattle and that he was milking 20 cows at the time that he purchased the soybean meal. After purchasing the soybean meal he fed the cows daily a mixture of soybean meal and crushed corn, wheat shorts and beet pulp. About four weeks after he began feeding the soybean meal to the cattle, the cattle quit eating; their eyes became bloodshot; there was bleed-

ing from the nostrils, some of them passed blood from their udders. Five of the cows died and one other cow was ruined for a dairy cow. Several other witnesses who had purchased soybean meal from L. J. Thigpen about the same time, testified that their cattle had been affected in a similar manner. Dr. Vernon D. Chadwick, Executive Officer of the Livestock Sanitary Board, testified that he was notified of the diseases among the cattle in Pearl River County about December 21st. He made an immediate visit to the county and examined the diseased cattle on several farms. The animals appeared to be affected alike. The symptoms common to all seemed to be a weak and wobbly gait, hemorrhaging of the mucous membrane around the eyes and in the tail region. Some of the animals showed signs of diarrhea with a bloody tinge to the feces. Some of the animals showed two or three degrees of temperature. Dr. Chadwick testified that in his opinion soybean meal which had been processed by the use of trichloroethylene as a solvent, if fed to cattle over a considerable period of time, would eventually cause death; and that in his opinion the feeding of the tri-extracted soybean meal to the cattle which he had examined in Parl River County caused the death of the cattle.

Dr. Raymond T. Vaughn of the Barrow-Agee Laboratories of Memphis, Tennessee, testified that he had analyzed a sample of the soybean meal which had been sent to him by the law firm of Williams and Williams, of Poplarville, Mississippi, in September 1952, and that he had found that the meal contained a trace of trichloroethylene in a quantity of three parts per million. He stated that he did not know whether that amount of trichloroethylene was poison-

ous to cattle or not. He had no experience in solvent extractions and he knew nothing about the manufacture of soybean meal. Dr. G. Worthen Agee, a qualified chemist of the Barrow-Agee Laboratories, testified that he was not familiar with the technical phases of extracting soybean meal by the trichloroethylene process; but he knew that trichloroethylene had been used by the soybean industry as a solvent in extracting oil. He had read a good deal of literature on the poisonous effects on cattle of soybean meal extracted by the use of trichloroethylene. He stated that the first reference to the subject in point of time was contained in an article by Sir Stewart Stockman, of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, published in 1916. Stockman reported in that article that widespread deaths among cattle had occurred in southern Scotland, and that the deaths were caused by feeding soybean meal produc[illegible] by trichloroethylene extraction. Agee also stated that there were outbreaks of diseases among cattle in Germany, France and Holland during the early twenties, all of which were traced to the feeding of soybean meal produced by trichloroethylene extraction method. From his study of the subject the witness could say that "soybean meal produced by the process of extracting the beans with trichloroethylene has killed cattle in numerous instances and the meal can be regarded as extremely poisonous." He stated that in his opinion the amount of the residual trichloroethylene in the meal was not important. The important factor is that the meal has been produced by that process. He stated that the tri-processed soybean meal seemed to be poisonous only to ruminants or cud-chewing animals. Swine seemed to thrive on it.

L. L. Ford, who supervised the construction of the Magnolia plant during the fall and winter of 1950-1951, testified that he visited other plants using trichloroethylene as a solvent prior to the construction of the Magnolia plant and made contacts with Du Pont as the producer of the trichloroethylene solvent. He stated that Du Pont's representatives furnished information concerning the use of the solvent in the processing of soybean meal, and advice concerning the erection and equipment of the plant. R. Stewart Armstrong, a solvents technician of Du Pont, visited the plant at frequent intervals as the work was nearing completion. Ford stated that he followed the directions given to him by Du Pont's representative in all matters relating to the erection of the plant and the installation of proper machinery, and that he read all of the literature sent to him by Du Pont on the subject of manufacturing soybean meal by the use of trichloroethylene as an oil extraction solvent. The plant was completed and manufacturing operations were commenced about March 15, 1951. Operations were discontinued sometime during the month of May and were not resumed until October.

The carload of meal which Thigpen purchased from Magnolia was purchased during the fall of 1951 and was received by Thigpen about November 11. Ford stated that the meal was processed from the 1951 soybean crop; and it appears from the record that the trichloroethylene used in processing the meal was a part of a shipment of trichloroethylene received from Du Pont during the month of May. No other shipment of trichloroethylene was made by Du Pont to Magnolia until sometime during the month of November.

In the meantime, Du Pont had become alarmed during the early summer because of the outbreak of a hemorrhagic disease among cattle in Minnesota on farms using only tri-extracted soybean meal; and on July 31, 1951, Du Pont wrote a letter to Magnolia strongly recommending that sales of tri-extracted meal be confined to outlets other than cattle feed until more definite information was available from investigations then under way. The investigations referred to were investigations undertaken by Du Pont and the University of Minnesota. Du Pont contributed several thousand dollars to help finance the study. On July 31, 1951, Du Pont issued its letter of warning to all manufacturers of soybean meal who were using trichloroethylene as a solvent recommending that the sales of tri-extracted meal be confined to outlets other than cattle feed, until more definite information concerning the causes of the disease was available, and in October 1951 the National Soybean Processors' Association issued a notice to the trade recommending that tri-processed meal be so labeled and not be used for cattle feed.

The letter issued by Du Pont to Magnolia, dated July 31, 1951, was addressed to Lyman Reed, Sales Manager of the Magnolia Company, and was delivered to Lyman Reed and L. L. Ford personally by R. Stewart Armstrong on August 3, 1951. The letter was signed by C. B. Shepherd, Manager of the Chlorine Products Division of the Du Pont company, and was as follows:

"July 31, 1951

"Mr. Lyman Reed
Magnolia Soy Products Co.
Greenville, Mississippi

Dear Mr. Reed:

In recent months, there have been increasing indications that trichloroethylene-extracted soybean meal may be associated with a hemorrhagic disease in cattle which has been observed in widely-scattered areas. Research programs are now being undertaken by the University of Minnesota and Iowa State College to investigate the nature and causes of the disease and to determine if trichloroethylene-extracted meal is, in fact, a contributory factor.

The cause of the disease is unknown. The evidence that trichloroethylene-extracted meal is associated in any way with the disease is entirely circumstantial, but the most recent reports have all come from farms using this type of meal in their cattle feed. Thus, despite the satisfactory experience with trichloroethylene-extracted meal in the past, we cannot ignore the possibility that this meal under certain conditions, perhaps in combination with one or more other factors, may be associated with the particular hemorrhagic disease observed in Minnesota and other scattered points.

In view of the present uncertainty, we strongly recommend that sales of trichloroethylene-extracted meal be confined to outlets other than cattle feed until more definite information is available from the investigations now underway in Minnesota and Iowa. To the best of our knowledge, the hemorrhagic disease in question is peculiar to cattle only, and all the available evidence and experience indicates that

trichloroethylene-extracted meal is entirely satisfactory as a component for feeding hogs and poultry.'

Very truly yours,

(S.) C. B. SHEPHERD,

Manager, Chlorine Products Division".

Ford testified that the above mentioned letter was delivered to Lyman Reed in his presence on or about August 2, 1951. Ford stated that he and Reed read the letter immediately and became very much disturbed. He stated that he said to Armstrong: "90 per cent of our business is cattle feed and we can't sell a car a year other than for cattle feed, and now you tell us not to sell any more for cattle feed", and Armstrong said, "I didn't say that." Ford stated that he told Armstrong that Magnolia could not operate unless they sold soybean meal for cow feed. He stated that Magnolia ordered another shipment of trichloroethylene later in the year, and the shipment was received during the latter part of November.

R. Stewart Armstrong testified that he delivered letters similar to the above letter to all manufacturers of soybean meal who were using trichloroethylene as a solvent in the processing of the meal. Armstrong stated that there were eight mills that were using trichloroethylene for the extraction of oils from soybeans in 1951. Only one such mill was using trichloroethylene at the time of the trial, and its output was not being sold as cattle feed, but was being used for the feeding of chickens. Armstrong's testimony indicated that Du Pont was acquainted with the article published by Sir Stewart Stockman in 1916, and the problems that had been encountered in Germany, Holland and Belgium during the twenties. Du Pont

was also aware of the appearance of the disease in Colorado and Iowa in 1949.

The first point argued by the appellant's attorneys as ground for reversal on this appeal is that the record shows that the plaintiff's damage was not proximately caused by any negligence on the part of the defendant Du Pont and that the defendant cannot be held legally liable for such damage. The appellant says that, if it be conceded that the proof was sufficient to show that Du Pont was negligent in selling trichloroethylene to Magnolia for use in processing soybean meal for cattle feed, and if it be conceded that the sale and shipment in interstate commerce of trichloroethylene for use in processing soybean meal for cattle feed constituted a violation of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, the negligence of Du Pont in selling such chemical compound to Magnolia for use in processing soybean meal for cattle feed was abrogated by the letter written by Du Pont to Magnolia on July 31, 1951, and delivered by R. Stuart Armstrong to Reed and Ford in person approximately three months prior to the shipment of the car load of meal by Magnolia to Thigpen during the latter part of November, 1951. The appellant contends that the act of Magnolia in selling tri-extracted soybean meal for cattle feeding purposes after the receipt of Du Pont's warning letter was an independent intervening act which broke the chain of causation, in that Du Pont's negligence was no longer operative after the delivery of the above mentioned warning letter and the negligence of Magnolia in selling the tri-extracted soybean meal to Thigpen for cattle feeding purposes after receipt of the warning letter was the sole proximate cause of the death of the plaintiff's cattle.

The genral rule relating to the liability of a manufacturer for negligence to remote vendees or other third persons with whom he has had no contractual relations is stated in 65 C.J.S., 619, Negligence, par. 100a, as follows:

"it is a general rule that a manufacturer or seller of an article is not liable to a third person, who has no contractual relation with him, for negligence in the manufacture or sale of the article. This rule has been said to be the early general rule in this country, and has been said to have been abolished or abandoned in some jurisdictions. There are also well-recognized exceptions to the rule, as where the article causing the injury is inherently or imminently dangerous in kind, as discussed infra subdivision b of this section, or where the thing causing the injury is not imminently dangerous in kind, but is rendered dangerous by reason of some defect, infra subdivision c of this section, and it has been said that there has been a general tendency on the part of the Courts to broaden the exceptions."

Poisonous or dangerous drugs, as well as dangerous chemicals, are familiar examples of substances recognized as inherently dangerous within the meaning of the rule stated above. It is generally conceded that unwholesome or contaminated foods or beverages intended for human consumption are imminently dangerous, and an ultimate consumer may bring an action directly against a negligent manufacturer or packer for injuries resulting from the use of such dangerous articles, though there is no contractual relation between the parties. Jackson Coca Cola Bottling Co. v. Chapman, 196 Miss. 864, 64 So. 791, Pillars v. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., 117 Miss. 490, 78 So

365; Coca Cola Bottling Works v. Lyons, 145 Miss. 876, 111 So. 305; Chenault v. Houston Coca Cola Bottling Co., 151 Miss. 367, 118 So. 177; Bufkin v. Grisham, 157 Miss. 746, 128 So. 563; Coca Cola Bottling Works v. Simpson, 158 Miss. 390, 130 So. 479, 72 A.L.R. 143; Curtiss Cando Co. v. Johnson, 163 Miss. 426, 141 So. 762; Kroger Grocery Co. v. Lewelling, 165 Miss. 71, 145 So. 726. See Anno. 17 A.L.R. 688; 39 A.L.R. 995; 63 A.L.R. 343; 88 A.L.R. 350; 142 A.L.R. 1491.

The appellee contends that the rule of liability applied in the cases cited above should be applied in cases involving the manufacture of animal foods. The appellant contends, however, that the distinctive rule that has been applied in cases of manufacturers or packers of foods and beverages intended for human consumption is not applicable in cases involving animal foods, where the damages sued for are damages to property and not for personal injuries; and the appellant cites in support of its contention the case of Windram Mfg. Co. v. Boston Blacking Co. (1921), 239 Mass. 123, 131 N.E. 454, 17 A.L.R. 669, wherein the Court said: "No authority has been called to our attention which imposes a common law duty of care toward strangers to the contract, upon the maker of an article which is not inherently dangerous, but is likely to cause a loss to property because of careless preparation." But in so far as the Windram case states and relies upon any "general rule" of nonliability of a manufacturer for negligence, it may be regarded as repudiated by the decision in Carter v. Yardley & Company, Ltd., 319 Mass. 92, 64 N.E. 2d 693, 164 A.L.R. 559; and whether the specific holding of the Windram case would stand under the view now adopted in Massachusetts is open to serious question. See Note 164 A.L.R. 569, 594.

Whatever the rule may have been originally, the principle seems now to be well established by the decisions of many Courts that a person who has had no direct contractual relations with a manufacturer may nevertheless recover from such manufacturer for damages to property caused by the negligence of the manufacturer in the same manner that such a remote vendee or other third person can recover for personal injuries. "The modern doctrine may be regarded as allowing recovery for injury or damage to property in all instances where a case in tort law of negligence can be made out against the manufacturer—that is, where the requisite elements of foreseeability and breach of duty are established, where the manufacturer can be found to have been negligent, and such negligence was the proximate cause of the property damage." Anno. 164 A.L.R., 593. See Ellis v. Lindmark (1929), 177 Minn. 390, 225 N.W. 395; Hunter v. Allied Mills (1937), 184 S.C. 330, 192 S.E. 356; Ebers v. General Chemical Co. (1945), 310 Mich. 261, 17 N.W. 2d 176, E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Barndon (1934, C.C.A. 8th Ct.), 73 F. 2d 26

However, it is not necessary for us to undertake to determine at this time whether or not the rule of legal liability applied by our own Court in the cases involving manufacturers of foods and beverages intended for human consumption should be applied in cases involving manufacturers of animal foods. Neither is it necessary for us to undertake to define the exact limits of legal liability of a manufacturer of a chemical compound, which may be harmless, or beneficial when properly used for its intended purpose but is likely to cause injury when improperly used, or when used for an improper purpose, who undertakes to direct or recommend the manner in which or the

purposes for which such chemical compound shall be used but fails to exercise reasonable care commensurate with the dangers involved in giving such directions and making such recommendations.

We think that the proof in this case fails to show that DuPont's negligence was the proximate cause of the injury to the plaintiff's cattle. If Du Pont is to be held liable in a case of this kind, such liability must be predicated upon Du Pont's failure to exercise due care in warning Magnolia of the danger incident to the use of trichloroethylene as a solvent in the processing of soybean meal for cattle feed. But the proof shows that Du Pont did warn Magnolia if the dangers incident to the use of trichloroethylene as a solvent in the manufacture of soybean meal for cattle feed approximately three months prior to the date of the sale of the carload of meal to Thigpen; and even though it may appear that Du Pont should have warned Ford and his associates prior to August 3, 1951, it cannot be said that Du Pont's failure to give such warning at an earlier date was the proximate cause of the death of the plaintiff's cattle.

After a careful examination of the record in this case, we think that the act of Magnolia in selling the trichloroethylene extracted soybean meal for cattle feed after the receipt of the Du Pont warning letter of July 31, 1951, was an intervening act sufficient to break the chain of casual relationship between Du Pont's negligence and the injury to the plaintiff's cattle.

The record shows that trichloroethylene was a solvent used for many purposes. It had many legitimate uses. If Du Pont owed a duty to Magnolia and

the plaintiff as a user of Magnolia's products to warn Magnolia of the dangers incident to the use of trichloroethylene as a solvent in the manufacture of soybean meal for cattle feed, Du Pont discharged that duty by writing and delivering to Magnolia the warning letter dated July 31, 1951. The warning letter was specific and its meaning clear; and Du Pont was not liable for Magnolia's failure to heed that warning.

"One who acts negligently is not bound necessarily to anticipate that another person will be negligent after the latter has discovered the danger arising from the former's negligence. The first actor, however, is not permitted to assume that the second actor will discover the danger caused by the first actor's negligence. Accordingly, where the second actor after having become aware of the existence of a potential danger created by the negligence of the first actor, acts negligently in respect of the dangerous situation and thereby brings about an accident with injurious consequences to others, the first actor is relieved of liability, because the condition created by him was merely a circumstance and not the proximate cause of the accident." 38 Am. Jur. 731, Negligence, par. 72.

After R. Stewart Armstrong had delivered Du Pont's warning letter to Ford and Reed on August 3, 1951, Du Pont had a right to believe that Magnolia would confine its sales of tri-extracted soybean meal to outlets other than cattle feed until more definite information was available from the investigations then under way. Du Pont had a right to believe that the warning letter would not be disregarded; and we think that Magnolia's conscious act in refusing to heed the warning and in selling the carload of tri-extracted soybean meal to Thigpen for cattle feeding

purposes after being apprised of the potential danger, constituted an independent, efficient intervening cause, which was not foreseeable by Du Pont, or, in other words, constituted a superseding cause of the injury operating to eliminate Du Pont's responsibility for its original negligence, if there was such negligence in fact. Wissman v. General Tire Co. of Philadelphia, Inc., 192 Atl. 633, 327 Pa. 215, (Pa. S. Ct. 1937); Kapp v. E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co., 57 F. Supp 32 (1944); Foster v. Ford Motor Co. (1926), 139 Wash. 341, 46P945; Catlin v. Union Oil Co. (1916), 31 Cal. App. 597, 161 P. 29; Harper v. Remington Arms. Co., 280 N.Y.S. 862; Ford Motor Co. v. Wagoner, 183 Tenn. 392, 192 S.W. 2d 840, 852, 164 A.L.R 364; Mississippi City Lines, Inc., v. Bullock et al., 194 Miss. 630, 13 So. 2d 34; Stewart v. Kroger Grocery, etc., Co., 198 Miss. 371, 21 So. 2d 912.

We do not think that the statements alleged to have been made by R. Stewart Armstrong to Ford and Reed at the time he delivered the warning letter to Ford and Reed detracted from the force of the warning letter. Magnolia did not manufacture soybean meal for Du Pont. Magnolia was an independent manufacturer of soybean products and was in a position to exercise its own judgment in the sale of its products to distributors for resale to ultimate consumers.

In view of the conclusions that we have reached on the question of proximate cause, it is not necessary for us to consider the question as to whether the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act was applicable to the sale of trichloroethylene by Du Pont to Magnolia.

"It is not material whether the negligence complained of in an action was the violation of a duty imposed by the common law or the violation of one imposed by a statute or ordinance, so far as concerns the requirement that negligence must have been the proximate cause of the plaintiff's injury to warrant a recovery. * * * If the violation of the statute or ordinance by the defendant was not the direct and proximate cause of the accident, he is not liable for the injury of which complaint is made." 38 Am. Jur. 837, Negligence, par. 166.

For the reasons stated above the judgment of the lower Court is reversed and judgment will be entered here in favor of the appellant.

Reversed and Judgment Rendered for Appellant.

All Justices Concur, Except Hall J., who Took No Part.

Certificate of Clerk.

State of Mississippi,
County of Hinds. ss.

I, Tom Q. Ellis, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, do hereby certify that the annexed and foregoing constitutes and is a true copy of the Opinion rendered by the Supreme Court of Mississippi on June 14, 1954, in that certain cause heretofore pending in said Court numbered 39,116, entitled "E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, vs. Frank Ladner", which said Opinion is now reported in 73 So.2d pp. 249-256, and which said Opinion is now on file and of record in my office and in my custody,

and which said Cause No. 39,116 was an appeal from the Circuit Court of Pearl River County, Mississippi.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal at Jackson, Mississippi, this the 21st day of September, 1954.

TOM Q. ELLIS,
Clerk of the Supreme Court
of the State of Mississippi,
By JULIA KENDRICK,
(Seal) D. C.

EX. B.

Established 1802

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company
Incorporated

Wilmington 98, Delaware

Electrochemicals Department

July 31, 1951

Mr. Lyman Reed, Sales Manager
Magnolia Soy Products Company
Greenville, Mississippi

Dear Mr. Reed:

In recent months, there have been increasing indications that trichlorethylene-extracted soybean meal may be associated with a hemorrhagic disease in cattle which has been observed in wide-scattered areas. Research programs are now being undertaken

by the University of Minnesota and Iowa State College to investigate the nature and causes of the disease and to determine if trichlorethylene-extracted meal is, in fact, a contributory factor.

The cause of the disease is unknown. The evidence that trichlorethylene-extracted meal is associated in any way with the disease is entirely circumstantial, but the most recent reports have all come from farms using this type of meal in their cattle feed. Thus, despite the satisfactory experience with trichlorethylene-extracted meal in the past, we cannot ignore the possibility that this meal under certain conditions, perhaps in combination with one or more other factors, may be associated with the particular hemorrhagic disease observed in Minnesota and other scattered points.

In view of the present uncertainty, we strongly recommend that sales of trichlorethylene-extracted meal be confined to outlets other than cattle feed until more definite information is available from the investigations now underway in Minnesota and Iowa. To the best of our knowledge, the hemorrhagic disease in question is peculiar to cattle only, and all the available evidence and experience indicates that trichlorethylene-extracted meal is entirely satisfactory as a component for feeding hogs and poultry.

Very truly yours,

C. B. SHEPHERD,

(C. B. Shepherd),

Manager, Chlorine Products Division.

CBS/a

Certificate of Clerk.

State of Mississippi,
County of Hinds. ss.

I, Tom Q. Ellis, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, do hereby certify that the annexed and foregoing is a true, perfect, complete, and correct copy of "Ex G—21—Deft. Test. of Armstrong" appearing as Page 467 of the Record on Appeal in that certain cause heretofore pending in the Supreme Court of Mississippi numbered 39,116, entitled "E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company vs. Frank Ladner", which said Record on Appeal is on file and of record in my office and in my custody, and which said cause was an appeal from the Circuit Court of Pearl River County, Mississippi.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal at Jackson, Mississippi, this the 21st day of September, 1954.

TOM Q. ELLIS,
Clerk of the Supreme Court
of the State of Mississippi,
By JULIA KENDRICK,
D. C.

(Seal)

United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as the Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, Defendant.

Affidavit of Charles A. Kline, Jr.

State of Delaware,
County of New Castle. ss.

Charles A. Kline, Jr. being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says: that he is employed by E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company in the capacity of Assistant-Treasurer of the Company, and that he is fully conversant and familiar with the matters hereinafter deposed to; that accounts receivable and other evidences of cash and credit sales come within the supervision of his department and are under his direction and control; that he has examined or caused to be examined the records of all transactions, either on a cash or credit basis, during the years 1951 and 1952; that the said George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as the Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, plaintiff, made no purchases of any kind from the said defendant, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, during these years and there are no trade balances indicated on the said records in any way involving, designating or naming the said George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as the Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai.

plaintiff, as a customer or otherwise during the said years.

CHARLES A. KLINE, JR.,
(Charles A. Kline, Jr.).

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th day of September, 1954.

L. B. GORMAN,
(Seal) Notary Public in and for the State and County aforesaid.

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

Geroge T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as the Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, Defendant.

This cause having come before the Court upon defendant's motion for summary judgment under Rule 56, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Court having heard argument of counsel for the defendant and plaintiff and being fully advised in the premises, it is, this 18 day of January, 1955,

Ordered, that defendant's motion for summary judgment is denied.

ALLEN COX,
Judge.

Seen, and Approved as to Form Only:
CARL E. GEUTHER,
(Carl E. Geuther),
By E. T. T.
WALTER D. FORD,
(Walter D. Ford),
By E. T. T.
WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
By EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas),
Attorneys for Defendant.
C. O. B.-1, Page 249.

MOTION FOR JOINT TRIAL AND CONSOLIDATION UNDER RULE 42 (a) Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Filed this 17 day of Nov. 1955.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,

v. Civil Action No. 145.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Plaintiff,

v. Civil Action No. 143.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Come now each of the plaintiffs in the above-mentioned cases and hereby move for an order for joint trial and consolidation of all three causes on the following grounds:

1. That in all three actions there are common questions of law and fact;

2. That by joint trial and consolidation unnecessary costs and delay would be avoided;

3. That as between the several plaintiffs there is no conflict of interest;

4. That heretofore, all motions in these causes have been jointly heard and depositions herein jointly made;

5. That defendant would not be prejudiced by the granting of this motion and justice will be promoted by joint trial and consolidation; and

6. That plaintiffs are represented by Roger E. Brooks and William G. Burgin, Jr., assisted by respective counsel from the Territory of Hawaii as shown in the records of these causes and each of the plaintiffs will save much expense by joint trial and consolidation.

This motion is based on the records of these causes and on the affidavit hereto attached.

Dated: November 14th, 1955.

PRATT, TAVARES & CASSIDY,
SHIRO KASHIWA,
WM. G. BURGIN, JR.,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brookes),
Attorneys for Plaintiffs.

Certificate.

I, Roger E. Brooks, of counsel for plaintiffs in the above-captioned cases do hereby certify that I have served the above and foregoing Motion on counsel of record for the defendant herein by mailing this date, United States air mail, postage prepaid, true copy thereof, to Earl T. Thomas, Esq., whose address is Lamar Life Building, Jackson, Mississippi.

Witness my hand, this the 14th day of November, 1955.

ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks).

Affidavit of Roger E. Brooks.

District of Columbia. ss.

Roger E. Brooks, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says:

1. That he is counsel of record in all three of the above-entitled causes; that he is fully familiar with the pleadings and depositions filed in all three causes; that he is fully familiar with the facts and evidence to be adduced to prove said facts in all three causes.

2. That all causes of action in each of three cases arise out of the processing of soybean meal by the Magnolia Soy Products Company of Greenville, Mississippi, upon advice and counsel of defendant corporation, using a chemical known as trichloroethylene manufactured and claimed to have been recommended by the defendant corporation; that all three cases have identically similar proof with relation to the

above; that upon shipment to Hawaii the plaintiffs suffered damage by reason of cattle deaths caused by the feeding of said Magnolia soybean meal; that an experimental feed test was conducted in the Territory of Hawaii of Magnolia feed above mentioned, the said feed test is common evidence in all three cases; that there will be presented other proof common to all three cases; that the law questions applicable to all three cases are substantially identical.

3. That the only difference in the three cases will be the question of damage suffered by the respective plaintiffs.

4. That by the joint trial and consolidation of all three cases, large costs will be saved by all plaintiffs.

5. That as between the three plaintiffs there is no conflict of interests; that defendant in all three cases is the same corporation.

6. That heretofore all motions in these three cases have been jointly heard; that all depositions taken in all three cases have been jointly taken and filed in these causes.

7. That all plaintiffs are represented, in addition to Roger E. Brooks and William G. Burgin, Jr., as shown by the records of these causes, by counsel from the Territory of Hawaii and it would save them considerable time and expense by a joint trial and consolidation.

8. That affiant believes that defendant would not be prejudiced by a joint trial and consolidation; that

there will be a savings of considerable expense and time by defendant to have a joint trial and consolidation in all three cases.

9. That an order of joint trial and consolidation would materially promote justice in all three cases without any prejudice to any plaintiff or the defendant.

ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks).

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 14th day of November, 1955.

ELIZA W. MERRILL,
(Seal) Notary Public, D. C.

My Commission Expires November 30, 1958.

ORDER FOR JOINT TRIAL AND CONSOLIDATION.

Filed this 22 day of Nov. 1955.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,

v. Civil Action No. 145.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Plaintiff,

v. Civil Action No. 143.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Upon the Motion of the plaintiffs in Civil Actions Nos. 142, 143 and 145 in this Court, all as above entitled, it appearing and this Court finding:

1. That in all three of said actions there are common questions of law and fact;

2. That by joint trial and consolidation unnecessary costs and delay would be avoided;

3. That as between the several plaintiffs there is no conflict of interest;

4. That heretofore all motions in all of said causes have been jointly heard and depositions have been jointly taken and filed;

5. That the same corporation is defendant in all of said actions;

6. That defendant would not be prejudiced by the granting of said motion and justice would be promoted by joint trial and consolidation; and

7. That plaintiffs are all represented by common counsel, namely, Roger E. Brooks and William G. Burgin, Jr., who are assisted by respective counsel from the Territory of Hawaii as shown in the records of said causes, and each of the plaintiffs will save much expense by joint trial and consolidation.

Now, Therefore, It Is Ordered:

That all of said three actions are hereby consolidated for trial of all issues of law and fact, and for all other purposes, except that under proper instructions of the Court the jury shall be authorized to bring in a separate verdict or separate verdicts in each action as the Court may hereafter find to be advisable and proper. This Nov. 22, '55.

ALLEN COX,
District Judge.

Consent:
WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS and
CARL E. GUENTHER,
By EARL T. THOMAS,
CARL E. GEUTHER,
Attorneys for Defendant.

C.V.O.B. No. 1, Page 288

Filed this 3 day of June 1954.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Counsel for plaintiff and defendant in the above-captioned cause hereby stipulate that the depositions of Lawrence W. Campos, Francis C. Ching, Thomas B. Cockett, Dr. Robert Cross, Desmond Fletcher, Dr. G. C. Folger, William R. Ford, Robert Gould, Max F. Landgraf, Louis V. Luck, Frank Olim, Dr. William F. Parker, Stanley H. N. Waldron, Dr. E. H. Willers and W. Y. Young to be taken on June 17, 1954, at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, by C. Nils Tavares, Esquire, in the matter of Fred L. Wadron, Limited, v. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, who will note his appearance as counsel for

the plaintiff, may be used by plaintiff in this cause in the same manner and to the same extent said depositions could be used if taken by the plaintiffs, George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, subject to the procedures established by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

SHIRO KASHIWA,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks),
Attorneys for Plaintiffs.
WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
CARL E. GEUTHER,
WALTER D. FORD,
By CARL E. GEUTHER,
Attorneys for Defendant.

WM. G. BURGIN, JR.,
(Wm. G. Burgin, Jr.).

STIPULATION.

Filed this 21 day of July 1955.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Counsel for plaintiffs and defendant in the above-entitled cause hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

That the plaintiffs subject to, and only to, such objections as would be available to the defendant to the originals, may tender in evidence at the trial of this cause copies of original documents received by the defendant from Magnolia Soy Products Company, L. L. Ford, L. L. Ford Associates, Lyman Reed, Allen Jackson, O. H. Sale, James M. Warren and Davidson-Kennedy Company, set out and described in the Answer and Additional and Supplemental Answers of defendant in reply to Interrogatories of the plaintiffs of record in this cause, said copies to be of the same force and effect for all purposes as the original documents would be, if offered and admitted in evidence.

Dated this 27th day of June, 1955.

SHIRO KASHIWA,
PRATT, TAVARES & CASSIDY,
WM. G. BURGIN, JR.,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks),
Attorneys for Plaintiffs.
WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
CARL E. GEUTHER,
WALTER D. FORD,
By EARL T. THOMAS,
Attorneys for Defendant.

We, the jury, find for the Defendant.

Nov. 29, 1955.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Re No. 11 of Designation:

For Direction for Entry of Judgment—See "Judgment", No. 15 of Designation.

MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL.

Filed this 10 day of Dec. 1955.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

vs. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Now come the plaintiffs in the above entitled consolidated actions and move this Honorable Court for a new trial upon the following grounds:

1. The verdict of the jury is contrary to the overwhelming weight of evidence.

2. The verdict of the jury is contrary to law.

3. The Court erred in failing to grant each and all of the instructions requested by the plaintiffs, covering the applicable law, except a portion of one instruction, and thereby failed to make clear to the jury the exact issues involved and the reasons therefor, to such extent that it is obvious that the jury misunderstood the few instructions given by the Court.

4. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by the plaintiffs, that the care of a prudent man varies according to circumstances dependent upon the degree of danger; that what is the pre-

cise legal intent of the term must depend, in the nature of things, upon the circumstances of each individual case; that it is a relative and not an absolute term; and that the degree of care and foresight which is necessary in any given case must always be in proportion to the nature and magnitude of the injuries and damages which might result from the occurrence which is to be anticipated and guarded against. The substance of said requested instruction is set forth in plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 2.

5. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by the plaintiffs, that under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, the causing of the introduction into interstate commerce of soy bean oil meal which is known to be intended for cattle feed and which is unfit for cattle feed is prohibited; that said Act further prohibits the shipment in interstate commerce of tri solvent which the sender knows may become a component part of feed that is unfit for cattle and is intended to be sold for cattle feed; and that said Act further prohibits the shipment of trichloroethylene solvent in interstate commerce unless the container thereof bears a label specifically informing prospective users as to its safe use; that if the jury should find by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant in shipping tri solvent in interstate commerce to Magnolia Soy Products Company violated said Act, such violation would constitute negligence as a matter of law, and that unless the jury should further find that the defendant was exonerated by an intervening cause, the verdict should be for the plaintiffs; all as requested by plaintiffs' requested instructions Nos. 3, 4, and 5. Such instructions would have made the jury aware of the rele-

vancy and materiality of actions of defendant violative of the said Federal Act, as circumstances to be taken into consideration in considering the question of possible intervening cause, as well as establishing proximate cause between defendant's actions in connection with the construction of the Magnolia mill and the final damage to plaintiffs.

6. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury as to the relevancy and applicability and materiality of the Hawaii Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 6. Such instructions would have made the jury aware of the relevancy and materiality of actions of defendant violative of the said Act, as circumstances to be taken into consideration in considering the question of possible intervening cause, as well as establishing the proximate cause between defendant's actions in connection with the construction of the Magnolia Mill and the final damage to plaintiffs.

7. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 7, as to the meaning of the term proximate cause, thereby tending to permit the jury to be confused in its consideration of the other instructions given by the Court which failed to show the jury the relationship of the various items of evidence to each other and to the ultimate issues, and caused them to misunderstand and misconstrue the instructions given, in relation to the letter of July 31, 1951, All Plaintiffs Exh. No. 35.

8. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No.

7(a), that, under the circumstances outlined in said requested instruction No. 7(a), acts of Magnolia subsequent to the acts of defendant mentioned in said requested instruction, would not constitute a sufficient intervening cause to discharge defendant from liability for its negligence if, among other things, listed in said instruction, Magnolia Soy Products Company's acts which caused the injuries to the plaintiffs were a normal response to a situation created by du Pont's conduct and the manner in which Magnolia acted was not highly extraordinary under the circumstances.

9. The Court erred in failing to include in its charge to the jury, which included a portion of plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 7(a), the remainder of said requested instruction setting forth the applicable law to the effect that an intervening act of a third person, negligent in itself, is not a superseding cause of injury to another which the actor's negligent conduct is a substantial factor in bringing about, under certain circumstances set forth in said omitted portion, which would have given greater understandability to the jury of a proposition of law applicable to the facts of this case that was and is extremely difficult to understand.

10. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 8, that if under the circumstances outlined in said requested instruction, the jury should find that a reasonable person in the situation of defendant would or should have realized that there was a realizable likelihood that the Magnolia Soy Products Company would act in a particular manner, and that this was a hazard which made the defendant negligent in its

act or acts, then intervening acts of said Company, whether innocent, negligent, tortious or criminal, would not prevent the defendant from being liable to plaintiffs.

11. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 9, as to the meaning of an intervening cause as a new and independent cause, and that, unless the intervening cause is both new and independent, sufficient of itself to stand as the cause of the injury, breaking the casual connection, the original wrongdoer is not relieved from the legal responsibility for his wrong or negligence.

12. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 10, as to the extent of the duty on the part of a manufacturer who manufactures an article, with actual or imputable knowledge that it will be put to a certain use that will create unusual hazards, to give adequate warning, not only to immediate purchasers of the product, but also to classes of persons in the situation of plaintiffs, and the effect of failure to adequately so warn them.

13. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury specifically with respect to the letter of July 31, 1951, as requested by Plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 11, as to the matters to be considered by the jury in determining whether or not the letter of July 31, 1951, was adequate notice to the Magnolia Soy Products Company so as to prevent the defendant from being liable to plaintiffs for any negligent acts; the effect of failure to so instruct the jury left them

without any guide, or any adequate guide, to assist them in understanding the more general charge given by the Court, which related to a subject and a proposition of law extremely difficult to understand, namely the subject of intervening cause.

14. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by plaintiffs' requested instructions Nos. 12 and 13, and each of them, as to what an implied warranty as to fitness for an intended purpose of use is, and as to what an implied warranty as to merchantability is, and as to the meaning and effect of said respective implied warranties with respect to the issues of this case, all of which left the jury in a confused state of mind as to the meaning and import of the various counts of plaintiffs' actions, and the relation of said implied warranties to the overall picture given by the evidence.

15. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 14, that if concurrent or successive negligence of two persons combined results in injury to a third person, he may recover of either or both.

16. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 16, that, among other things, plaintiffs were entitled to prospective profits, as damages, and in instructing the jury that the plaintiffs were not entitled to any such profits at all.

17. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 17, generally as to the purport of each count of plain-

tiffs' complaints, and in failing to permit the jury to pass upon each count separately, excluding, however Count Three, which was withdrawn.

18. The Court erred in admitting certain evidence, as shown by the reporter's notes in this case, over the objection of plaintiffs.

19. The effect of said errors in failing to instruct the jury or in instructing the jury as the Court did, as hereinabove specified, and as set forth in the Court's instructions actually given, was to leave the jury in a state of confusion and lack of understanding of and as to: (a) the various issues of fact involved; (b) the principles of law applicable thereto; (c) the interrelationship between various phases or portions of the evidence and other portions of such evidence; (d) the meaning of the term negligence and the effect of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of the Federal Government and of the Territory of Hawaii, and each of them, upon the question of negligence, actual, imputed, implied, or per se; (e) and various other aspects hereinbefore set forth in this motion.

(20) The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury that in determining whether the letter of July 31, 1951, was a sufficient and intervening act to break the casual connection between the negligence of the defendant and plaintiffs' injuries and damage, said jury should take into consideration the acts and statements, if any, made by defendant's agent at the time said letter was delivered, together with all of the prior and subsequent dealings between Magnolia and the defendant, du Pont.

KASHIWA & KASHIWA,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
WM. G. BURGIN, JR.,
Attorneys for Plaintiffs,
By WM. G. BURGIN, JR.,
(Wm. G. Burgin, Jr.).

516 2nd Avenue North,
Columbus, Mississippi.

Certificate.

I, Wm. G. Burgin, Jr., of counsel for George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, do hereby certify that I have served a copy of the foregoing motion for a new trial on counsel for defendant, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, by mailing this date, United States Air Mail, postage prepaid, two copies thereof, respectively, to Carl E. Geuther, 709i du Pont Building, Wilmington, Delaware, and Mr. Earl T. Thomas, Wells, Thomas & Wells, 900 Lamar Life Building, Jackson, Mississippi.

Witness my hand this the 8th day of December, A. D. 1955.

WM. G. BURGIN, JR.,
(Wm. G. Burgin, Jr.).

ORDER.

United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, d/b/a Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

vs. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, Defendant.

This day this cause coming on to be heard on the Motion for a New Trial as filed by the Plaintiffs herein, and the Court having read and considered said Motion and heard and received arguments of counsel for the Plaintiffs and Defendant thereon, and being of the opinion that neither said Motion nor the grounds thereof are well taken and that said Motion should be denied, and premises considered;

It Is Therefore Ordered and Adjudged that the Motion for a New Trial, as filed by Plaintiffs herein, George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, d/b/a Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, be, and the same is, hereby denied.

Ordered and Adjudged this 2nd day of February, A. D. 1956.

/ALLEN COX,
United States District Judge

C.O.B. 1, Page 304.

JUDGMENT.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, Defendant.

This cause came on for trial before the Court and a jury, beginning on November 22, 1955, and continuing to and on November 29, 1955 (the intervening Thanksgiving and Sunday excepted), and the issues having been duly tried, and the jury on November 29, 1955, having rendered a verdict for the Defendant, it is hereby

O ered and Adjudged, that Plaintiffs take nothing by eir action, that the Defendant, E. I. du Pont de :mours & Company, have judgment on the verdic against the Plaintiffs, George T. Nishida and Jar s E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Compa of Kauai, a co-partnership, and that said Defen nt have and recover from said Plaintiffs its co in the action.

I ed Dec. 2, 1955.

I the Court:

HERBERT D. STEPHENS, JR., Clerk.

To The Clerk:
Form of Judgment Approved:

Enter:
ALLEN COX,
United States District Judge.

Civil Order Book No. 1, Page 294.

NOTICE OF APPEAL.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Plaintiffs, George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a Corporation, herein and hereby appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit from the judgment entered in the above-entitled cause on February 2, 1956, denying plaintiffs' motion for a new trial.

SHIRO KASHIWA,
WILLIAM G. BURGIN, JR.,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks),
Attorneys for Plaintiffs.

Filed this 1 day of March 1956.

Motion of Plaintiffs to Extend Time for Filing Record on Appeal in Appellate Court;

Order entered 4/10/56 Extending time to File Record on Appeal in Appellate Court;

Omitted from the Printed Record, Pursuant to Designations of Counsel as to Printing Record copied at pages 1 et seq.

* * * * * * * *

APPELLANTS' DESIGNATION OF RECORD ON APPEAL.

Filed this 21 day of May 1956.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs.

v. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,

v. Civil Action No. 145.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Plaintiff,

v. Civil Action No. 143

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Pursuant to Rule 75(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the plaintiffs-appellants hereby desig-

nate for inclusion in the record on appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, taken by notices of appeal filed March 1, 1956, the following portion of the records, proceedings and evidence in the three above-captioned actions:

1. Complaints filed December 9, 1953 in each of the above-captioned causes.

2. Answers to complaints filed January 14, 1954 in each of the above-captioned causes.

3. Motion of defendants for summary judgment.

4. Order denying motion for summary judgment.

5. Motion to consolidate the three actions.

6. Order granting motion to consolidate.

7. Stipulations entered of record.

8. Written instructions filed by plaintiffs.

9. Ruling of the Court denying request for allowance of plaintiffs' written instructions.

10. Exception to ruling of the Court denying plaintiffs' request for allowance of written instructions.

11. Verdict, together with the direction for the entry of judgment thereon.

12. Opinion.

13. Plaintiffs' motion for new trial.

14. Order entered February 2, 1956, denying plaintiffs' motion for new trial.

15. Judgment.

16. Notices of appeal filed.

17. Typewritten transcript of the opening statement of the Court to the jury and charge of the Court to the jury and of the testimony taken at the trial of these causes of the following-named witnesses:

For the plaintiffs—L. L. Ford and Dr. Raymond T. Vaughn;

For the defendant—R. Stuart Armstrong, C. B. Shepherd, Frank McDonald and .....

18. Copy of this designation of record on appeal on behalf of plaintiffs-appellants, dated May 24, 1956.

19. Statement of points on which appellants rely.

20. Plaintiffs' Hawaiian depositions, together with all exhibits attached thereto, and all exhibits admitted in evidence on behalf of plaintiffs.

21. All exhibits offered in evidence by plaintiffs, the admission of which was refused.

PRATT, TAVARES & CASSIDY,
INGMAN & INGMAN,
SHIRO KASHIWA,
WILLIAM G. BURGIN, JR.,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
Attorneys for Plaintiffs-Appellants.

By WM. G. BURGIN, JR.,
(Wm. G. Burgin, Jr.).

516 Second Avenue North,
Columbus, Mississippi.

Certificate.

I, Wm. G. Burgin, Jr., of counsel for plaintiffs, hereby certify that I have this day mailed a true copy of the foregoing Designations, postage prepaid, to Honorable Earl T. Thomas, Attorney, Lamar Life Building, Jackson, Mississippi and to Honorable Carl E. Guether, Attorney, DuPont Building, Wilmington, Del. counsel for defendant.

This the 21st day of May, A. D. 1956.

WM. G. BURGIN, JR.,
(Wm. G. Burgin, Jr.).

STATEMENT OF POINTS RELIED UPON BY PLAINTIFFS.

Filed this 21 day of May 1956.

In the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Appellants,

v. No. 142, 145, 143.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

The points upon which the appellants intend to and do rely on this appeal are as follows:

1. The verdict of the jury is contrary to the overwhelming weight of evidence.

2. The verdict of the jury is contrary to law.

3. The Court erred in failing to grant each and all of the instructions requested by the plaintiff, covering the applicable law, except a portion of one instruction, and thereby failed to make clear to the jury the exact issues involved and the reasons therefor, to such extent that it is obvious that the jury misunderstood the few instructions given by the Court.

4. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by the plaintiff, that the care of a prudent man varies according to circumstances dependent upon the degree of danger; that what is the precise legal intent of the term must depend, in the nature of things, upon the circumstances of each individual case; that it is a relative and not an absolute term; and that the degree of care and foresight which is necessary in any given case must always be in proportion to the nature and magnitude of the injuries and damages which might result from the occurrence which is to be anticipated and guarded against. The substance of said requested instruction is set forth in plaintiff's requested instruction No. 2.

5. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by the plaintiff, that under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, the causing of the introduction into interstate commerce of soybean oil meal which is known to be intended for cattle feed and which is unfit for cattle feed is prohibited; that said Act further prohibits the shipment in interstate commerce of a chemical solvent which the seller-shipper knew or should have known would be used in the manufacture of and become a component part of unfit food for cattle and which would be sold for feed for cattle; and that said Act further prohibits the shipment of the chemical solvent trichloroethylene, hereinafter referred to as tri or tri-solvent, in interstate commerce unless the container thereof bears a label specifically informing prospective users as to its safe use; that if the jury should find by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant in shipping tri-solvent in interstate commerce to Magnolia Soy Products Company violated said Act, such

violation would constitute negligence as a matter of law, and that unless the jury should further find that the defendant was exonerated by an intervening cause the verdict should be for the plaintiffs; all as requested by plaintiffs' requested instructions Nos. 3, 4 and 5. Such instructions would have made the jury aware of the relevancy and materiality of actions of defendant violative of the said Federal Act, as circumstances to be taken into consideration in considering the question of possible intervening cause, as well as establishing proximate cause between defendant's actions in connection with the construction of and the operation of the Magnolia Mill and the final damage to plaintiffs.

6. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury as to the relevancy, and applicability and materiality of the Hawaii Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 6. Such instruction would have made the jury aware of the relevancy and materiality of actions of defendant violative of the said Act, and therefore negligence as a matter of law, as circumstances to be taken into consideration in considering the question of possible intervenining cause, as well as establishing the defendant's actions, in connection with the construction and operation of the Magnolia Mill, the sale of tri to Magnolia for the processing of soybeans for feed for cattle as the proximate cause of the final damage to plaintiffs.

7. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 7, as to the meaning of the term proximate cause, thereby tending to permit the jury to be confused in

its consideration of the other instructions given by the Court which failed to show the jury the relationship of the various items of evidence to each other and to the ultimate issues, and caused them to misunderstand and misconstrue the instructions given, in relation to the letter of July 31, 1951. All Plaintiffs' Exh. No. 35.

8. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 7(a) that, under the circumstances outlined in said requested instruction No. 7(a), acts of Magnolia subsequent to the acts of defendant mentioned in said requested instruction, would not constitute a sufficient intervening cause to discharge defendant from liability for its negligence if, among other things, listed in said instruction, Magnolia Soy Products Company's acts which caused the injuries to the plaintiffs were a normal response to a situation created by du Pont's conduct and the manner in which Magnolia acted was not highly extraordinary under the circumstances.

9. The Court erred in failing to include in its charge to the jury, which included a portion of plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 7(a), the remainder of said requested instruction setting forth the applicable law to the effect that an intervening act of a third person, negligent in itself, is not a superseding cause of injury to another which the actor's negligence conduct is a substantial factor in bringing about, under certain circumstances set forth in said omitted portion, which would have given greater understandability to the jury of a proposition of law applicable to the facts of this case that was and is extremely difficult to understand.

10. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 8, that if under the circumstances outlined in said requested instruction, the jury should find that a reasonable person in the situation of defendant would or should have realized that there was a realizable likelihood that the Magnolia Soy Products Company would act in a particular manner, and that this was a hazard which made the defendant negligent in its act or acts, then intervening acts of said Company, whether innocent, negligent, tortious or criminal, would not prevent the defendant from being liable to plaintiffs.

11. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 9, as to the meaning of an intervening cause as a new and independent cause, and that, unless the intervening cause is both new and independent, sufficient of itself to stand as the cause of the injury, breaking the casual connection, the original wrongdoer is not relieved from the legal responsibility for his wrong or negligence.

12. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 10, as to the extent of the duty on the part of a manufacturer who manufactures an article, with actual or imputable knowledge that it will be put to a certain use that will create unusual hazards, to give adequate warning, not only to immediate purchasers of the product, but also to classes of persons in the situation of plaintiffs, and the effect of failure to adequately so warn them.

13. The Court erred in failing to instruct the ury specifically with respect to the letter of July 31, 1951,

as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 11, as to the matters to be considered by the jury in determining whether or not the letter of July 31, 1951, was adequate notice to the Magnolia Soy Products Company so as to prevent the defendant from being liable to plaintiff for any negligent acts; the effect of failure to so instruct the jury left them without any guide, or any adequate guide, to assist them in understanding the more general charge given by the Court, which related to a subject and a proposition of law extremely difficult to understand, namely the subject of intervening cause.

14. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury that in determining whether the letter of July 31, 1951, was a sufficient and intervening act to break the casual connection between the negligence of the defendant and plaintiffs' injuries and damage, said jury should take into consideration the acts and statements, if any, made by defendant's agent at the time said letter was delivered, together with all of the prior and subsequent dealings between Magnolia and the defendant du Pont.

15. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by plaintiffs' requested instructions Nos. 12 and 13, and each of them, as to what an implied warranty as to fitness for an intended purpose of use is, and as to what an implied warranty as to merchantability is, and as to the meaning and effect of said respective implied warranties with respect to the issues of this case, all of which left the jury in a confused state of mind as to the meaning and import of the various counts of plaintiffs' actions, and the relation of said implied warranties to the overall picture given by the evidence.

16. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 14 that if concurrent or successive negligence of two persons combined results in injury to a third person, he may recover of either or both.

17. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 16 that, among other things, plaintiffs were entitled to prospective profits, as damages, and in instructing the jury that the plaintiffs were not entitled to any such profits at all.

18. The Court erred in failing to instruct the jury, as requested by plaintiffs' requested instruction No. 17, generally as to the purport of each count of plaintiffs' complaints, and in failing to permit the jury to pass upon each count separately, excluding, however, Count Three, which was withdrawn by consent of parties.

19. The Court erred in admitting certain prejudicial evidence, as shown by the reporter's notes in this case, over the objection of plaintiffs.

20. The effect of said errors in failing to instruct the jury or in instructing the jury as the Court did, as hereinabove specified, and as set forth in the Court's instructions actually given, was to leave the jury in a state of confusion and lack of understanding of and as to: (a) the various issues of fact involved; (b) the principles of law applicable thereto; (c) the interrelationship between various phases or portions of the evidence and other portions of such evidence; (d) the meaning of the term negligence and the ef-

fect of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of the Federal Government and of the Territory of Hawaii, and each of them, upon the question of negligence, actual, imputed, implied, or per se; (e) and various other aspects hereinbefore set forth.

21. For the reasons set forth in paragraphs numbered 1 to 20, both inclusive, hereof, the Court erred in denying plaintiffs' motion for a new trial.

PRATT, TAVARES & CASSIDY,
INGMAN & INGMAN,
SHIRO KASHIWA,
WILLIAM G. BURGIN, JR.,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
By WM. G. BURGIN, JR.,
Attorneys for Appellants.

Certificate.

I, Wm. G. Burgin, Jr., of counsel for plaintiffs, hereby certify that I have this day mailed a true copy of the foregoing Statement of Points relied on by Plaintiffs to Honorable Earl T. Thomas, Attorney, Lamar Life Building, Jackson, Mississippi and to Honorable Carl E. Guether, Attorney, Du Pont Building, Wilmington, Del., counsel for defendants.

This the 21st day of May, 1956.

WM. G. BURGIN, JR.,
(Wm. G. Burgin, Jr.).

Appellants' Designation of Contents of Record on Appeal; Omitted from the Printed Record, pursuant

to Designations of Counsel as to Printing Record, copied at pages 1 et seq.

* * * * * * * *

MOTION FOR TRANSMISSION OF CERTAIN ORIGINAL RECORDS TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT AT NEW ORLEANS.

Filed May 21—'56.

Allen Cox, Judge.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,

v. Civil Action No. 145.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Plaintiff,

v. Civil Action No. 143.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Now come the plaintiffs in the above-entitled consolidated actions and move this Honorable Court, pur-

suant to Rule 75 (i), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, for an order directing that the original depositions, together with the attached exhibits and all additional exhibits admitted in evidence as filed of record in this Court be transmitted to the Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit at New Orleans, for inspection and consideration by that Court in connection with the appeal transcript of the other proceedings had and further, directing that the printing, typing, mimeographing or duplicating by any process of the said depositions and exhibits be dispensed with and the original depositions and exhibits as filed be transmitted in lieu of any and all copies.

The grounds for this motion are that the printing, typing, mimeographing or duplicating by any process of the said records would place upon the plaintiffs an unnecessarily heavy financial burden.

PRATT, TAVARES & CASSIDY.
SHIRO KASHIWA,
INGMAN & INGMAN,
WILLIAM G. BURGIN, JR.,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
By WM. G. BURGIN, JR.,
Attorneys for Plaintiffs.

Certificate.

I, Roger E. Brooks, of counsel for appellants do hereby certify that I have this day mailed to Earl T. Thomas, Esquire, at his address, Lamar Life Building, Jackson, Mississippi, and to Carl E. Geuther, Esquire, at his office, Du Pont Building, Wilmington, Delaware, counsel for appellee, true copies of the

above and foregoing motion, this, the 19th day of May, 1956.

WM. G. BURGIN, JR.

ORDER TO SEND TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT AT NEW ORLEANS ORIGINAL DEPOSITIONS AND EXHIBITS IN LIEU OF ALL COPIES.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,

v. Civil Action No. 145.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Plaintiff,

v. Civil Action No. 143.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

On motion of the plaintiffs-appellants, there being no objection by defendant-appellee, the Court being fully advised in the premises and finding that good

cause for the Order sought does exist, it is, pursuant to Rule 75(i), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, ordered that the Clerk of this Court transmit the original depositions, together with the attached exhibits, and all additional exhibits admitted in evidence as filed of record in this Court, together with, and at the time of the forwarding of, the transcript of the other proceedings had on appeal in the captioned causes, to the Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit at New Orleans to be inspected and considered by that Court in connection with the transcript of the other proceedings, and that the printing, typing, mimeographing or duplicating of said depositions and exhibits be and the same is hereby dispensed with, as said original depositions and exhibits are transmitted to said Appellate Court in lieu of any and all copies; and

It Is Further Ordered that the Clerk of this Court bind or attach said depositions and exhibits in such manner as to the said Clerk may be deemed proper and expedient for the preservation of the sequence of said depositions and exhibits to permit easy reference thereto by said Appellate Court and that said Clerk of the Court transmit with said depositions and exhibits a certificate identifying them with reasonable definiteness, which certificate shall accompany said depositions and exhibits and appeal transcript at the time they are transmitted to the said United States Court of Appeals; and

It Is Further Ordered upon final determination of said causes that said original depositions and exhibits be returned to the Clerk of this Court to be by him kept on file in this Court.

Ordered this 21 day of May, 1956.

ALLEN COX,
United States District Judge.

No objection as to form:

.....
Attorneys for defendant-appellees.

C.O.B. 1, Pages 316-317.

COUNTER-DESIGNATION OF ADDITIONAL PORTIONS OF RECORD ON APPEAL.

Filed this 28 day of May 1956.

United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a Co-Partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Please take notice that E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, Defendant-Appellee, hereby designates the following portions of the record and proceedings, in addition to those designated by Appellants, to be certified by the Clerk of the United States District Court aforesaid and to be filed with the Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for

the Fifth Circuit as the Record on Appeal in this action:

1. Motion of Defendant for a Directed Verdict, as to the Complaint herein and any and all Counts thereof, made at the close of Plaintiffs' case, which written Motion was filed and made a part of the records herein on November 28, 1955, the motion to file said written Motion having been made and permission so thus to file granted by the Court as appears from Page 264 of the Typewritten Transcript herein;

2. Order of the Court overruling the last above-mentioned Motion for Directed Verdict, which Order appears on Page 268 of the Typewritten Transcript herein;

3. Motion of Defendant for a Directed Verdict on Counts One, Two and Three, known as the Contract Counts, made at the close of Plaintiffs' case, which written Motion was filed and made a part of the record in this cause on November 28, 1955, the motion to file said written Motion having been made and permission so thus to file granted by the Court as appears from Page 269 of the Typewritten Transcript herein;

4. Order of the Court overruling the last above-mentioned Motion for Directed Verdict, which Order appears on Page 271 of the Typewritten Transcript herein;

5. Motion of Defendant for a Directed Verdict, as to the Complaint herein and any and all Counts thereof, made at the close of all the evidence in this case,

which written Motion was filed and made a part of the record in this cause on November 29, 1955, the motion to file said written Motion having been made and permission so thus to file granted by the Court as appears from Page 438 of the Typewritten Transcript herein;

6. Order of the Court overruling the last above-mentioned Motion for Directed Verdict, which Order appears on Page 438 of the Typewritten Transcript herein;

7. Motion of the Defendant for a Directed Verdict as to Counts One, Two and Three, known as the Contract Counts, made at the close of all the evidence in this case, which written Motion was filed and made a part of the record in this cause on November 29, 1955, the motion to file said written Motion having been made and permission so thus to file granted by the Court as appears from Page 438 of the Typewritten Transcript herein;

8. Order of the Court overruling the last above-mentioned Motion for Directed Verdict, which Order appears on Page 439 of the Typewritten Transcript herein;

9. All Exhibits admitted in evidence in this cause on behalf of Defendant, these Exhibits being received in evidence and marked with the following Exhibit numbers, and a summary description of each Exhibit being set forth as follows.

Exhibit Number	Summary Description
D-1	List of cattle at Hilo Dairy.
D-2	Ledger account for cattle for Hilo Dairy.
D-3	Summary of cows purchased since July 1, 1946.
D-4	Letter of October 11, 1949, from Lyman Reed to F. G. Low of du Pont.
D-5	Photostatic copies of chemical safety data sheets and other printed matter.
D-6	Photostatic copy of underwriters laboratories card on cleaning liquid.
D-7	Photostatic copy of printed material on du Pont chlorinated hydrocarbons.
D-8	Letter from Magnolia Soy Products Company, by L. L. Ford, dated February 14, 1952, to Mr. C. B. Shepherd, du Pont.
D-9	Photostatic copy of an excerpt from "Feedstuffs", a weekly newspaper dated October 6, 1951.
D-10	Letter from C. B. Shepherd to Lyman Reed dated July 31, 1951.
D-11	Copy of original Order from Magnolia Soy Products Company to E. I. du Pont, the Order having been entered on October 2, 1951, and the invoice being dated November 21, 1951.
D-12	Factory shipping advice from du Pont to Magnolia Soy Products Company, shipping date shown as November 19, 1951.
D-13	An Acknowledgment of Order from du Pont to Magnolia Soy Products Company showing the Order entered October 2, 1951, front and reverse.
D-14 a	Copy of Uniform Straight Bill of Lading issued by Illinois Central Railroad Company showing car number IC-27892 was received for shipment in Greenville, Mississippi, on November 26, 1951

Exhibit Number	Summary Description
D-14 b	Copy of Memorandum of Bill of Lading issued by Illinois Central Railroad Company showing that car number IC-27831 was received for shipment in Greenville, Mississippi, on November 26, 1951.
D-14 c	Copy of Uniform Straight Bill of Lading issued by Illinois Central Railroad Company showing car number IC-32008 was received for shipment in Greenville, Mississippi, on the 23rd day of November, 1951.
D-15 a	Copy of Memorandum of Bill of Lading issued by Illinois Central Railroad Company showing that car number NYC-178296 was received for shipment on the 26th day of November, 1951.
D-15 b	Copy of Memorandum of Bill of Lading issued by Illinois Central Railroad Company showing that car number SOU-22061 was received for shipment from Greenville, Mississippi, on December 8, 1951.
D-15 c	Shipping Order of Illinois Central Railroad Company showing that car number NH-33672 was received for shipment from Greenville, Mississippi, on December 10, 1951.
D-16	Request of the Court to take judicial notice of the law of the State of New York;

10. All colloquies between Counsel, and between Court and Counsel, as appear from Page 439 to Page 463, both inclusive of the Typewritten Transcript; and

11. This Counter-Designation.

EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas).

Office and Post Office Address:
9 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi.

CARL E. GEUTHER,
Attorneys for Appellee-Defendant.

Office and Post Office Address:
798 Du Pont Building,
Wilmington, Delaware.

WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
9 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi.
Of Counsel.

Affidavit of Service.

State of Mississippi,
County of Hinds.

Earl T. Thomas, being by me first duly sworn, makes oath that he has served the above and foregoing Counter-Designation of Additional Portions of Record on Appeal on Counsel for the Plaintiffs by mailing this date, first class air mail, postage prepaid, true copies thereof respectively, to the follow-

ing Attorneys of Record for the Plaintiffs, at the following respective addresses thereof:

William G. Burgin, Jr., Esq.
516 North Second Avenue
Columbus, Mississippi
Roger E. Brooks, Esq.
923—20th Street, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.
Nils Tavares, Esq.
Messrs. Pratt, Tavares & Cassidy
Alexander & Baldwin Building
Honolulu, Hawaii
Shiro Kashiwa, Esq.
Messrs. Kashiwa & Kashiwa
Hawaiian Trust Building
Honolulu, Hawaii
David Ingman, Esq.
Alexander Young Building
Honolulu, Hawaii;

their usual and respective post office addresses.

EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas).

Sworn to and subscribed before me, this the 28th day of May, 1956.

JEWELL BEARD,
(Seal) Notary Public.

My Commission Expires November 10, 1959.

ORDER TO SEND TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT AT NEW ORLEANS ORIGINAL DEPOSITIONS AND EXHIBITS AND COURT FILES IN LIEU OF ALL COPIES.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Kyoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,

v. Civil Action No. 145.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Plaintiff,

v. Civil Action No. 143.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

On motion of the plaintiffs-appellants, there being objection by defendant-appellee, the Court being fully advised in the premises and finding that good cause for the Order sought does exist, it is, pursuant to Rule 75(i), Federal Rules and Civil Procedure, ordered that the Clerk of this Court transmit the original complaints, answers to complaints, motion of defendants for summary judgment, order denying motion for summary judgment, motion to consolidate

the three causes of action, order granting motion to consolidate, stipulations entered of record, written instructions filed by plaintiffs, plaintiffs' motion for new trial, order denying plaintiffs' motion for new trial, judgment, notices of appeal filed, motion to extend time to file and docket appeal, together with order thereon, designation of record on appeal, statement of points on which appellants rely, plaintiffs' original Hawaiian depositions, together with the attached exhibits, and all additional exhibits admitted in evidence as filed of record in this Court, together with, and at the time of the forwarding of, the transcript of the other proceedings had on appeal in the captioned causes, to the Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit at New Orleans to be inspected and considered by that Court in connection with the transcript of the other proceedings, and that the printing, typing, mimeographing or duplicating of said depositions and exhibits be and the same is hereby dispensed with, as said original depositions and exhibits are transmitted to said Appellate Court in lieu of any and all copies; and

It Is Further Ordered that the Clerk of this Court bind or attach said original Court records, depositions and exhibits in such manner as to the said Clerk may be deemed proper and expedient for the preservation of the sequence of said depositions and exhibits to permit easy reference thereto by said Appellate Court and that said Clerk of the Court transmit with said depositions and exhibits a certificate identifying them with reasonable definiteness, which certificate shall accompany said depositions and exhibits and appeal transcript at the time they are transmitted to the said United States Court of Appeals; and

It Is Further Ordered upon final determination of said causes that said original Court records, depositions and exhibits be returned to the Clerk of this Court to be by him kept on file in this Court.

Ordered this 29 day of May, 1956.

ALLEN COX,
United States District Judge.

C.O.B. 1, Pages 318-319.

COMPLAINT.

Filed this 9 day of Dec. 1953.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi.

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,
vs. Civil Action No. 145.
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation,
Defendant.

Count One.

1. The plaintiff is and at all times mentioned in this complaint was a resident of Kapaa District of the County of Kauai, Island of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii, and for many years prior to the date hereof, the plaintiff was and is now engaged in a dairy business within the Territory of Hawaii under the name and style of "Sokei Dairy".

2. The defendant is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its domicile and principal office in Wilmington, Delaware, and having qualified to do business and doing business in the State of Mississippi, and having appointed an agent for the service of process for suits in said State, to wit: R. H. Thompson, in Jackson, Hinds County, Mississippi, upon whom service of process may be had.

3. The matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of Three Thousand Dollars ($3,000.00), exclusive of interest and costs.

4. The jurisdiction of the Court is invoked under Section 1332, Title 28, U. S. Code, June 25, 1948, c. 646, 62 Stat. 930; and under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, Chapter 9, Title 21, U. S. Code, June 25, 1938, c 675, 52 Stat. 1040.

5. During the year 1951 and continuously for many years prior thereto the plaintiff has been and is now engaged in the aforesaid dairy business in the County of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii; the said business consisting of raising, feeding and maintaining cows for the purpose of milking said cows and selling the milk obtained throughout the County of Kauai.

6. On or about the end of 1951, up to the time of the occurrence of the incidents hereinafter more particularly described, the plaintiff owned and was using in the said dairy business about one hundred and thirty-five head of good dairy cows and in addition owned thirty male calves and twenty-one female calves; the latter calves plaintiff was raising for use

as dairy cows; the said business was a prosperous and profitable one with excellent good will and a large number of customers throughout the said County of Kauai; and all of said cattle and the dairy business were at all times mentioned owned by the plaintiff.

7. In December, 1951, January, 1952 and February, 1952, plaintiff for a fixed consideration ordered for purchase from Fred L. Waldron, Limited a corporation, incorporated under the laws of the Territory of Hawaii, with its principal office at all times herein mentioned at 808 Fort Street, Honolulu, City and County of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, a total of 380 sacks of soybean meal weighing 100 pounds per sack; of the 380 sacks 120 sacks were ordered in December, 1951, 100 sacks were ordered in January, 1952, and 160 sacks were ordered in February, 1952; the said Waldron, Limited, on receipt of each order of purchase agreed to accept it and in accordance with said agreements did sell and deliver to plaintiff the 380 sacks of soybean meal weighing 100 pounds per sack and the said meal was accepted by plaintiff.

8. For many years prior and to the date of this complaint, the said Waldron, Limited, was extensively engaged in the business of buying and selling feeds of all kinds for cattle and during the said period in the course of its business sold a considerable amount of various cattle feed in the County of Kauai.

9. The plaintiff for years prior and continuously during the year 1951 and including the time of the occurrence of the transactions herein alleged, purchased from the said Waldron, Limited, cattle feed

including soybean meal and in all of said purchases the plaintiff relied exclusively on the skill and judgment of the said seller in selecting cattle feed, including soybean meal of good quality and fit for consumption by plaintiff's cattle and the said Waldron, Limited, in all of the purchases aforementioned and during the stated period of time well knew all of the facts alleged in paragraph 5 of Count One hereof and that any soybean meal purchased by plaintiff was for the purpose of feeding it to plaintiff's aforesaid dairy herd.

10. Upon delivery of the 380 sacks of soybean meal as aforesaid, plaintiff fed the said meal to all the cattle aforementioned in paragraph 6 hereof, except those dairy cows which were not at that time producing milk, and as a result of the consumption of the said meal by the aforesaid cattle out of plaintiff's herd of about 188 head, 52 milking cows and 51 calves died and the remainder of the herd, with the exception of those dairy cows not fed the meal contained in the aforesaid 380 sacks, became violently ill; the meal in said sacks contained poisonous and toxic matter which directly and proximately caused the aforesaid deaths and violent illnesses of the cattle of the plaintiff and required plaintiff to employ labor in disposing of the dead cattle and to employ veterinarians and additional labor to care for the said herd, and as a direct result of the deaths of the dairy cows and calves and the violent illness of the remainder of plaintiff's herd of cattle, with the exception of those dairy cows not fed said meal as aforesaid, plaintiff has not been and will not be able to supply milk to many of his customers, has lost thereby a large number of customers and the good will of

his business with the consequent loss ot profits and he will continue to suffer great loss of profits.

11. The said Waldron, Limited, for a fixed consideration placed an order to purchase two hundred (200) tons of solvent soybean meal sacked in burlap bags with The Brode Corporation of Memphis, Tennessee, and the purchase order was accepted by confirmation of sale of the said corporation dated October 30, 1951.

12. The said Brode Corporation for a fixed consideration placed an order of purchase for the meal described in paragraph numbered 11 hereof with the Magnolia Soy Products Company of Greenville, Mississippi, and the said Company accepted the order and as part thereof, did ship through interstate commerce to the said Waldron, Limited at Port Allen, in the Territory of Hawaii, the said 380 sacks of soybean meal, extracted with trichloroethylene, sold and delivered by Waldron, Limited, as herein alleged to the plaintiff with the resulting loss to the dairy herd of the plaintiff aforementioned.

13. The said soybean meal, extracted with trichloroethylene, as manufactured by the said Magnolia Soy Products Company, was placed in the aforesaid 380 sacks by the said company at its plant in Mississippi and it was received by the said Waldron at the designated port of Port Allen in the Territory of Hawaii, in the original sacks of the aforesaid, each sack having attached when received, the said Company's identification tag, and the said 380 sacks of meal, each with said Company's identification tag attached, were delivered as aforesaid by Waldron to

the plaintiff, each sack having been unopened from the time it was placed in shipment by the said Company until received by the plaintiff and by him opened for the feeding of the contents to his aforesaid dairy herd.

14. The defendant was engaged, among other activities, in the manufacture, for sale and distribution through interstate commerce, of certain chemical compounds and sold and shipped through interstate commerce, to Magnolia Soy Products Company a chemical solvent, to wit: trichloroethylene, for use in extracting soybean oil from soybeans, then and there well knowing that the soybean meal, from which the soybeans oil was to be extracted by use of its product trichloroethylene was to be sold for cattle feed; the defendant at the time of making the sale of the aforesaid chemical solvent to Magnolia Soy Products Company then and there knew, or by the exercise of ordinary care could have known, that soybean meal which had the soybean oil extracted therefrom by the use of the said chemical solvent became unfit for and dangerous as food for cattle, and knew or by the exercise of ordinary care could have known that said solvent, if used for the purpose for which the defendant recommended, sold and delivered it to the Magnolia Soy Products Company for use by the company in the manner which defendant knew it would be used, would cause the soybean meal to become poisonous to and unfit as food for cattle.

15. The defendant well knew, or should have known, that soybean meal when processed with its manufactured product trichloroethylene for sale and

delivery through interstate commerce for feed for cattle was toxic and poisonous and would when fed to cattle, including the cattle of the plaintiff, result in great and serious damage and the defendant through the sale and delivery of the said solvent for the aforesaid purpose then and there breached its implied warranty that soybean meal so manufactured would be fit and wholesome food for consumption by plaintiff's said dairy herd; the implied warranty was a material part and condition of the sale transaction and plaintiff relied on said warranty.

16. By reason of said breach of implied warranty, plaintiff has suffered great damage; the damages hereinafter claimed and alleged are damages for losses directly and proximately and naturally resulting in the ordinary course of events from the breach of warranty aforealleged by the defendant; at the time of the sale and delivery aforealleged the defendant well knew, or should have known, that all of the losses hereinafter set forth would directly and proximately result from the said sale and delivery of poisonous and toxic soybean meal; the poisonous and toxic condition of the said meal resulted directly from the use in its processing and manufacturing of trichloroethylene manufactured, sold and delivered by the defendant to the Magnolia Soy Products Company; all losses for which damages are hereinafter claimed were all reasonably foreseeable.

17. Plaintiff suffered the following specific and special damages: From the deaths of 51 head of good, high quality calves, $14,400.00; from the deaths of 52 head of good, high quality milking cows, $41,600.00; from the violent illnesses of the remainder of the

plaintiff's herd of good, high quality milking cows, fed the aforesaid soybean meal, which said cows are now as a result of said illness, neither marketable nor are they good milk producers, $30,000.00; from, as alleged herein, the inability of the plaintiff to supply milk because of the reduction of the dairy herd through the aforesaid deaths and violent illness of the milking cows, resulting in loss of a large number of customers and the good will of the business, $30,000.00; from the purchase at great cost and expense of a large amount of milk from suppliers in Honolulu, Hawaii, to permit plaintiff to continue to supply some of his regular customers, $10,000.00; by reason of required services of veterinarians, $433.50; and by reason of the employment of labor primarily in disposing of dead cattle and secondarily in tending sick cattle, $2,560.40.

18. The plaintiff further claims as general damages the sum of $70,000.00. The total of plaintiff's damages, special and general, is $198,993.90.

19. Prior to the filing of this complaint the plaintiff requested and demanded of the defendant payment of damages as aforesaid but defendant has paid no part thereof and refuses to pay the said damages or any part thereof and there is now due and owing to the plaintiff from the defendant the total sum of $198,993.90 by reason of the breach of the aforesaid warranty.

Count Two.

1. Plaintiff reiterates and realleges all of the allegations in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of Count One hereof.

2. The defendant at the time of the aforementioned sale of and delivery of its manufactured product, the solvent trichloroethylene, to Magnolia Soy Products Company, knowing that the said Company would use the said solvent in extracting oil from soybeans and that the residual meal, including the aforesaid 380 sacks of meal sold and shipped in interstate commerce to the said Waldron, Limited, at Port Allen in the Territory of Hawaii, and by the said Waldron sold and delivered to the plaintiff for feed for his cattle, impliedly warranted to all purchasers including the plaintiff that the contents of the aforesaid 380 sacks of soybean meal were of merchantable quality; the implied warranty was a material part and condition of the sale transaction and plaintiff relied on said warranty, and the defendant well knew, or should have known, that the soybean meal manufactured through the use of the solvent trichloroethylene, for sale and delivery through interstate commerce to the general public and to Fred L. Waldron, Limited, for sale by the latter, within the said Territory for feed for cattle, including the cattle of plaintiff, was toxic and poisonous and would when fed to cattle result in great and serious damage and the defendant at the time of the aforesaid sale and delivery to the said Waldron then and there breached its implied warranty of the merchantable quality of the said soybean meal to the great damage to the plaintiff.

3. The damages set out and claimed in paragraphs 17 and 18 of Count One hereof are damages for losses directly and proximately and naturally resulting in the ordinary course of events from the breach by defendant of the aforesaid warranty of merchantable

quality, and were all reasonably foreseeable by the defendant.

4. Plaintiff reiterates and realleges all of the allegations in paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 of Count One hereof and demands payment of the damages set out in said paragraphs 17 and 18 by reason of the aforesaid breach of the defendant's implied warranty of merchantable quality.

Count Three.

1. Plaintiff reiterates and realleges all of the allegations in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of Count One hereof.

2. The defendant at the time of the aforementioned sale and at the time the said soybean meal was placed in the said 380 sacks by Magnolia Soy Products Company at its plant at Greenville, Mississippi, for shipment in interstate commerce to Waldron at Port Allen in the Territory of Hawaii, expressly warranted to all purchasers including the plaintiff that the contents of the aforementioned 380 sacks of soybean meal were of merchantable quality and fit for consumption by cattle and the express warranty was a material part and condition of the sale transaction and plaintiff relied on said warranty, and the defendant well knew, or should have known, that the soybean meal manufactured and processed through the use of its product the solvent trichlorothylene, for sale and delivery through interstate commerce to Fred L. Waldron, Limited, for sale within the Territory of Hawaii for feed for cattle, including the cattle of plaintiff, was toxic and poisonous and would

when fed to cattle result in great and serious damage and the defendant at the time of the aforesaid sale and delivery to the said Waldron then and there breached its express warranty of the merchantable quality and fitness for consumption by cattle of the said soybean meal to the great damage of the plaintiff.

3. The damages set out and claimed in paragraphs 17 and 18 of Count One hereof are damages for losses directly and proximately and naturally resulting in the ordinary course of events from the breach by defendant of the aforesaid express warranty of merchantable quality and fitness for consumption by cattle and were all reasonably foreseeable by the defendant.

4. Plaintiff reiterates and realleges all of the allegations in paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 of Count One hereof and demands payment of the damages set forth in said paragraphs 17 and 18 by reason of the aforesaid breach of the defendant's express warranty of merchantable quality and fitness for consumption.

Count Four.

1. Plaintiff reiterates an realleges all of the allegations in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 of Count One hereof.

2. That at all times mentioned herein the laws of the Territory of Hawaii, as material herein, provided as follows:

"Chapter 41. Food. Drugs and Cosmetics.

Sec. 2201. Definitions. For the purposes of this part:

(d) 'Food' means (1) articles used for food or drink for man or animals. . .(3) articles used for components of any such article. . .

Sec. 2206, Prohibited acts. The following acts and the causing thereof within the Territory by any person are hereby prohibited: (a) The manufacture, sale, or delivery, holding or offering for sale of any good, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded. . . . (c) The receipt in commerce of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded, and the delivery or proffered delivery thereof for pay or otherwise. . .

Sec. 2209, Foods deemed to be adulterated when. A food shall be deemed to be adulterated: (a) (1) If it bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render it injurious to health; but in case the substance is not an added substance such food shall not be considered adulterated under this clause if the quantity of such substance in such food does not ordinarily render it injurious to health; or (2) if it bears or contains any added poisonous or added deleterious substance which is unsafe within the meaning of section 2213; or (3) if it consists in whole or in part of a diseased, contaminated, filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance, or if it is otherwise unfit for food; or (4) if it has been produced, prepared, packed, or held under insanitary conditions whereby it may have become contaminated with filth, or whereby it may have been rendered diseased, unwholesome or injurious to health; . . .

3. That at all times mentioned herein the laws of the United States, as material herein, provided as follows:

Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (Vol. 5, FCA, Title 21).

"Sec. 321. Definitions: generally

(f) The term 'food' means (1) articles used for food or drink for man or other animals. . . (3) articles used for components of any such article.

"Sec. 331. Prohibited acts

The following acts and the causing thereof are hereby prohibited:

(a) The introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded.

(b) The adulteration or misbranding of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic in interstate commerce.

(c) The receipt in interstate commerce of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded, and the delivery or proffered delivery thereof for pay or otherwise. . ."

That the definition of adulterated food is the same as that recited above with relation to the laws of the Territory of Hawaii.

4. On or about December 1, 1951, plaintiff for a fixed consideration ordered for purchase from Fred

L. Waldron, Limited, Honolulu, Hawaii, 380 sacks of soybean meal to be used for feed for his cattle in this complaint described, the said Waldron, Limited, ordered for a fixed consideration said meal from The Brode Corporation of Memphis, Tennessee, and the Brode Corporation for a fixed consideration ordered for purchase, as set forth and alleged in paragraphs 11 and 12 of Count One hereof, the said soybean meal from the Magnolia Soy Products Company, Greenville, Mississippi.

5. The said Magnolia Soy Products Company accepted the said order and manufactured, packed, sold, shipped in interstate commerce and delivered the said 380 sacks of meal of 100 pounds each, to the said Waldron, at said port of Port Allen, County of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii, for sale by the said Waldron to the plaintiff for feed for his cattle.

6. The defendant was engaged, among other activities in the manufacture, for sale and distribution through interstate commerce, of certain chemical compounds and sold and shipped through interstate commerce to Magnolia Soy Products Company a chemical solvent, to wit: trichloroethylene, for use in extracting soybean oil from soybeans, then and there well knowing that the soybean meal, from which the soybean oil was to be extracted by use of its product trichloroethylene was to be sold for cattle feed; the defendant at the time of making the sale of the aforesaid chemical solvent to Magnolia Soy Products Company then and there knew, or by the exercise of ordinary care could have known, that soybean meal which had the soybean oil extracted therefrom by the use of the said chemical solvent became unfit for and dangerous as food for cattle,

and knew or by the exercise of ordinary care could have known that said solvent, if used for the purpose for which the defendant recommended, sold and delivered it to the Magnolia Soy Products Company for use by the Company in the manner which defendant knew it would be used, would cause the soybean meal to become poisonous to and unfit as food for cattle; the defendant knew that the chemical solvent trichloroethylene had caused death and injury to cattle when used for the aforesaid purpose at numerous previous times and would in this instance.

7. The defendant, at the time of the sale of the chemical solvent and its delivery through interstate commerce to Magnolia Soy Products Company or at any time thereafter, failed and neglected to inform the said Company, the plaintiff or the general public that the aforesaid chemical solvent when used to extract soybean oil made the residual soybean meal poisonous and injurious to and unfit and unsound as food for cattle; the defendant owed a duty to do so and the failure to perform this duty constituted negligence.

8. The defendant recommended the use of and sold and distributed trichloroethylene through interstate commerce as a solvent to remove soybean oil from soybeans, knowing that the residual meal was to be used as cattle food, knowing, or the defendant should have known, at the time of the sale and delivery of the trichloroethylene to Magnolia Soy Products Company that the Company would process, manufacture, market and distribute, through interstate commerce, to the general public the residual meal for use as cattle food and the said Company did manufacture, sell and distribute to the general pub-

lic, including the plaintiff, soybean meal so processed with the aforesaid solvent, the defendant having knowledge of the dangerous qualities of the solvent trichloroethylene.

9. The defendant having knowledge or being chargeable with knowledge, of the use to be made by the Magnolia Soy Products Company of the defendant's product trichloroethylene, the sale and distribution through interstate commerce of the residual meal and the damage to cattle of the meal when so processed as food for cattle, a duty arose on the part of the defendant to perform and carry out such test as would make certain that the aforesaid soybean meal would not be unfit, unsound and injurious to cattle when fed to them. This duty the defendant failed to perform, thus the defendant is guilty of negligence.

10. The aforesaid negligence of the defendant up to the time of the injury to the plaintiff directly and proximately caused the death and destruction of the plaintiff's dairy cattle, and all of the other injuries to plaintiff as herein specifically and generally set out.

11. The soybean meal, the contents of the said 380 sacks, was processed or manufactured through and by the use of the solvent, trichloroethylene, a product or chemical manufactured by and sold and delivered through interstate commerce by the defendant to the said Magnolia Soy Products Company, the said soybean meal so manufactured was highly toxic and poisonous and when fed after delivery as aforesaid, to plaintiff's herd of dairy cows caused 52 of the good quality milking cows, 30 male calves and 21 female calves, to die, and the remainder of the herd, with

the exception of those cows which were not at that time producing milk, and were not, therefore, fed the said meal, to become seriously ill.

12. The defendant, the manufacturer of the chemical trichloroethylene, knew or should have known that the trichloroethylene would be used for the stated purpose by the said Magnolia Soy Products Company, knew or should have known that the soybean meal resulting from the use of the said chemical would be sold and delivered through interstate commerce for feed for cattle, and knew or should have known that the residual meal so processed was toxic and poisonous and would when fed to cattle cause serious illness and death to the cattle; notwithstanding such knowledge or imputed knowledge, the defendant carelessly and negligently manufactured and delivered as aforesaid the said chemical; thereby and by reason thereof the death and illness of the cattle and all and every injury of the plaintiff as set forth in this complaint were directly and proximately caused by the sale and use of the said trichloroethylene in the processing of soybeans, resulting in the said poisonous and toxic meal.

13. There was a duty on the part of the defendant under the conditions and circumstances aforealleged to use reasonable care not to ship and deliver through interstate commerce the said trichloroethylene for use in the manufacture of soybean meal for feed for cattle, including the aforesaid cattle of the plaintiff; the failure of the defendant to exercise due care constituted negligence.

14. Plaintiff reiterates and realleges all of the allegations contained in paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 of Count One hereof.

15. By reason of said negligence the plaintiff suffered great damage; the damages claimed are set out in paragraphs 17 and 18 of Count One hereof and are damages for losses directly and proximately and naturally resulting in the ordinary course of events from the negligence of the defendant as aforesaid, in that defendant well knew, or should have known, at the time of the said delivery of the aforesaid meal that it would be, from the use of the defendant's manufactured chemical trichloroethylene, poisonous and toxic and that all of the losses aforesaid would directly and proximately result, for all of the losses for which damages are claimed as aforealleged were reasonably foreseeable.

16. The transaction upon which this cause of action is based is the same transaction alleged in Counts One, Two and Three of this Complaint.

Wherefore, the plaintiff demands judgment against the defendant in the sum of One Hundred Ninety Eight Thousand Nine Hundred Ninety Three Dollars and Ninety Cents ($198,993.90).

WINSTON C. INGMAN and
DAVID N. INGMAN,

566 Alexander Young Building,
Honolulu, Hawaii.

ROGER E. BROOKS,
By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks),
Attorneys for Plaintiff.

923—20th St., N.W.,
Washington, D. C.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL.

The plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues.

WINSTON C. INGMAN, and
DAVID N. INGMAN,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks).

ANSWER OF E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & COMPANY, DEFENDANT.

Filed this 14 day of Jan. 1954.

United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,
v. Civil Action No. 145.
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, Defendant.

Now comes E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, (hereinafter, for the sake of brevity, sometimes referred to variously as "Defendant," "this Defendant" or "du Pont"), the Defendant in the above entitled and numbered action, and files this, its Answer to the Complaint herein.

Answer to Count One.

First Defense.

Count One of the Complaint fails to state a claim against this Defendant upon which relief can be granted.

Second Defense.

Now responding to, and following the same numbering of paragraphs of, Count One of the Complaint, Defendant answers and says:

1.

Defendant alleges that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 1 of Count One of the Complaint, and, therefore, the allegations of said paragraph of Count One are denied.

2 and 3.

Defendant admits the allegations contained in paragraphs 2 and 3 of said Count One of the Complaint.

4.

Defendant admits that Plaintiff claims and invokes jurisdiction of this Court under the code sections and Acts of Congress referred to in paragraph 4 of Count One of the Complaint, but Defendant denies that this Honorable Court has jurisdiction of either the subject matter or the parties.

5-13, inclusive.

Defendant alleges that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 of Count One of the Complaint, and, therefore, each and every allegation contained

in all of said paragraphs in Count One of the Complaint are denied.

14.

Defendant denies each and every allegation of paragraph 14 of Count One of the Complaint, except Defendant admits that it was engaged, among other activities, in the manufacture, for sale and distribution through interstate commerce, of certain chemical compounds and sold and shipped through interstate commerce, to Magnolia Soy Products Company, a chemical solvent, to-wit: trichloroethylene, for use in extracting soybean oil from soybeans.

15 and 16.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 51 and 16 of Count One of the Complaint.

17 and 18.

For answer to paragraphs 17 and 18 of Count One of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraphs 17 and 18 of said Count One, as to the loss of high quality calves, loss of high quality milking cows, injury to other high quality milking cows, losses of milk profits, losses of good-will, expenses incurred in purchasing milk from outside sources to continue to supply regular purchasers, expenses incurred by the use of veterinarians, the employment of labor in disposing of dead cattle and

the tending of sick cattle, and further general damages, and, therefore, all allegations of Plaintiff in said paragraphs 17 and 18 are denied.

Defendant denies that any and all such alleged losses referred to in paragraphs 17 and 18 of Count One were the result of any negligence of the Defendant, or any act, or failure to act, or violation of any duty, by the Defendant.

19.

Defendant admits that Plaintiff has made demand upon it prior to the filing of this Complaint for payment of $198,993.90, and admits that Defendant has paid no part thereof and that Defendant has refused to pay said sum or any part thereof; but Defendant denies each and every other allegation contained in said paragraph 19 of Count One of the Complaint.

Answer to Count Two.

First Defense.

Count Two fails to state a claim against this Defendant upon which relief can be granted.

Second Defense.

Now responding to, and following the same numbering of paragraphs of, Count Two of the Complaint, Defendant answers and says:

1.

Defendant, for its answer to paragraph 1 of Count Two of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates and

adopts its answers to paragraphs 1 to 14, both inclusive, of Count One of the Complaint.

2 and 3.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 2 and 3 of Count Two of the Complaint.

4.

Defendant, for its answer to paragraph 4 of said Count Two of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates and adopts its answer to paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 of Count One of the Complaint, and denies the remainder of said paragraph 4 of Count Two of the Complaint.

Answer to Count Three.

First Defense.

Count Three of the Complaint fails to state a claim against this Defendant upon which relief can be granted.

Second Defense.

Now responding to, and following the same numbering of paragraphs of, Count Three of the Complaint, Defendant answers and says:

1.

Defendant, for its answer to paragraph 1 of Count Three of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates

and adopts its answers to paragraphs 1 to 14, both inclusive, of Count One of the Complaint.

2 and 3.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 2 and 3 of Count Three of the Complaint.

4.

Defendant, for its answer to paragraph 4 of Count Three of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates and adopts its answers to paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 of Count One of the Complaint, and denies the remainder of paragraph 4 of Count Three of the Complaint.

Answer to Count Four.

First Defense.

Count Four of the Complaint fails to state a claim against this Defendant upon which relief can be granted.

Second Defense.

Now responding to, and following the same numbering of paragraphs of, Count Four of the Complaint, Defendant answers and says:

1.

Defendant, for its answer to paragraph 1 of Count Four of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates

and adopts its answers to paragraphs 1 to 13, both inclusive, of Count One of the Complaint.

2 and 3.

Inasmuch as paragraphs 2 and 3 of Count Four of the Complaint allege the existence, not of facts, but of statutory law of the Territory of Hawaii and the United States, no answer thereto is required.

4 and 5.

Defendant alleges that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 4 and 5 of Count Four of the Complaint, and, therefore, the allegations in said paragraphs 4 and 5 of the said Count are denied.

6.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 6 of Count Four of the Complaint except Defendant admits that it was engaged, among other activities in the manufacture, for sale and distribution through interstate commerce, of certain chemical compounds and sold and shipped through interstate commerce to Magnolia Soy Products Company, a chemical solvent, to-wit: trichloroethylene, for use in extracting soybean oil from soybeans.

7.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 7 of Count Four of the Complaint.

8.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 8 of Count Four of the Complaint, except Defendant admits that it recommended the use of and sold and distributed trichloroethylene through interstate commerce as an extraction agent for the removal of oil from various types of agricultural products, including soybeans.

9 and 10.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 9 and 10 of Count Four of the Complaint.

11.

Defendant alleges that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 11 of Count Four of the Complaint, and, therefore, all allegations of Plaintiff in said paragraph 11 of Count Four of the Complaint are denied.

12.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 12 of Count Four of the Complaint.

13.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 13 of Count Four of the Com-

plaint. It is further specifically denied that any negligence of Defendant (which negligence is denied) was in any way related to or connected with any damage to Plaintiff and denies that Defendant violated, or failed to perform, any duty owed to the Plaintiff.

14.

Defendant, for answer to paragraph 14 of Count Four of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates and adopts its answers to paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 of Count One of the Complaint.

15.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 15 of Count Four of the Complaint.

16.

While this paragraph is nothing more than the conclusion of the pleader to which no answer is required, nevertheless, insofar as the same might be deemed proper pleading, the allegations of said paragraph 16 of Count Four of the Complaint are denied.

Third Defense.

For a third and further defense to the Complaint herein, and to each of the four Counts therein, Defendant alleges that this Court lacks jurisdiction over the person of this Defendant in that this Defendant is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware and was not and is not subject to ser-

vice of process within the Northern District of Mississippi.

Fourth Defense.

For a fourth and further defense to the Complaint herein, and to each of the four Counts therein, Defendant alleges that this Court lacks jurisdiction of the subject matter in that the Plaintiff is a citizen and resident of the Territory of Hawaii and Defendant is a citizen and resident of the State of Delaware, under the laws of which it was and is organized and wherein it has its domicile, the said Defendant not being subject to service of process in the Northern District of Mississippi, and no alleged cause of action accrued unto Plaintiff in the Northern District of Mississippi, and no act or omission of this Defendant is alleged to have occurred or been made in the Northern District of Mississippi.

Fifth Defense.

For a fifth and further defense to the Complaint herein, and to each of the four Counts therein, Defendant alleges that the venue of this action does not lie in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, or the Greenville Division therein, but, on the contrary, venue lies, if the suit is maintainable at all, in the United States District Court for the Jackson Division of the Southern District of Mississippi.

And now having answered the Complaint, and each and every Count therein, Defendant prays to be dismissed with costs.

W. C. WELLS, III,
EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas),
Attorneys for Defendant.

Address of each of above:
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi.
CARL E. GEUTHER,
7058 Du Pont Building,
Wilmington, Delaware.
WALTER D. FORD,
7055-A Du Pont Building,
Wilmington, Delaware.
WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi,
Of Counsel.

Affidavit of Service.

State of Mississippi,
County of Hinds.

Earl T. Thomas, being by me first duly sworn, states on oath that he has served the foregoing Answer on counsel for Plaintiff, by mailing this date, postage prepaid, true copies thereof respectively, to Winston C. Ingman and David N. Ingman, Esqs., 566 Alexander Young Building, Honolulu, Hawaii, Roger E. Brooks, Esq., 923-20th Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. and Wm. G. Burgin, Jr., Esq., Columbus, Mississippi. Attorneys for the Plaintiff.

EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas).

Sworn to and subscribed before me, this January 13th, 1954.

JEWELL BEARD,
(Seal) Notary Public.

My Commission Expires Nov. 4, 1955.

Motion of Defendant for Summary Judgment;

Notice of Hearing on above Motion;

Affidavit of Clark B. Shepherd, dated 9/21/54;

Affidavit of R. Stuart Armstrong, dated 9/21/54;

Exhibit "A"—Opinion rendered by the Supreme Court of Miss., in Case E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co., vs. Frank Ladner, Case No. 39,116;

Exhibit "B"—Letter, E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co., to Lyman Reed, Sales Mgr., Magnolia Soy Products Co., dated 7/31/51;

Affidavit of Charles A. Cline, Jr., dated 9/29/54;

Order entered 1/18/55 Denying Motion of Defendant for Summary Judgment;

Memorandum relative to Motion for Consolation, etc.,

Omitted from the Printed Record, being heretofore copied at pages 54 et seq.

* * * * * * * *

Filed this 3 day of June 1954.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi.

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,
v. Civil Action No. 145.
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Counsel for plaintiff and defendant in the above-captioned cause hereby stipulate that the deposition of Frank Fernandez to be taken on June 9, 1954, at Lihue, Kauai, Territory of Hawaii, by Shiro Kashiwa, Esquire, in the matter of George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as the Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, v. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, who will note his appearance as counsel for the plaintiff, may be used by plaintiff in this cause in the same manner and to the same extent said deposition could be used if taken by the plaintiff, Ryoju Sokei, subject to the procedures established by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

INGMAN & INGMAN,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks),
Attorneys for Plaintiff.

WM. G. BURGIN, JR.,
(Wm. G. Burgin, Jr.).

WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
CARL E. GEUTHER,
WALTER D. FORD,
By CARL E. GEUTHER,
Attorneys for Defendant.

Filed this 3 day of June 1954.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi.

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,
v. Civil Action No. 145.
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Counsel for plaintiff and defendant in the above-captioned cause hereby stipulate that the depositions of Lawrence W. Campos, Francis C. Ching, Thomas B. Cockett, Dr. Robert Cross, Desmond Fletcher, Dr. G. C. Folger, William R. Ford, Robert Gould, Max F. Landgraf, Louis V. Luck, Frank Olim, Dr. William F. Parker, Stanley H. N. Waldron, Dr. E. H. Willers and W. Y. Young be taken on June 17, 1954, at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, by C. Nils Tavares, Esquire, in the matter of Fred L. Waldron, Limited, v. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, who will note his appearance as counsel for the plaintiff, may be used by plaintiff in this cause in the same manner and to the same extent said depositions could be used if taken by the plaintiff, Ryoju Sokei, subject to the procedures established by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

INGMAN & INGMAN,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks),
Attorneys for Plaintiff.

WM. G. BURGIN, JR.,
(Wm. G. Burgin, Jr.).

WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
CARL E. GEUTHER,
WALTER D. FORD,
By CARL E. GEUTHER,
Attorneys for Defendant.

STIPULATION.

Filed this 28 day of July 1955.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Oxford Division.

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,
v. Civil Action No. 145.
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, Defendant.

Counsel for plaintiff and defendant in the above-entitled cause hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

That the plaintiff subject to, and only to, such objections as would be available to the defendant to the originals, may tender in evidence at the trial of this cause copies of original documents received by the defendant from Magnolia Soy Products Company, L. L. Ford, L. L. Ford Associates, Lyman Reed, Allen Jackson, O. H. Sale, James M. Warren and Davidson-Kennedy Company, set out and described in the Answer and Additional and Supplemental Answers of defendant in reply to Interrogatories of the plaintiff of record in this cause, said copies to be of the same force and effect for all purposes as the original documents would be, if offered and admitted in evidence.

Dated this 11th day of July, 1955.

WINSTON C. INGMAN and
DAVID N. INGMAN,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks),
Attorneys for Plaintiff.
WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
CARL E. GEUTHER,
WALTER D. FORD,
By EARL T. THOMAS,
Attorneys for Defendant.

Memorandum as to Verdict;

Motion of Plaintiff for New Trial;

Order entered 2/2/56 Denying Motion of Plaintiff for New Trial;

Judgment entered 12/2/55;

Omitted from the Printed Record, being heretofore copied at pages 97 et seq.

* * * * * * * *

NOTICE OF APPEAL.

Filed this 1 day of March 1956.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,
v. Civil Action No. 145.
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Plaintiff, Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, herein and hereby appeals to the United States District Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit from the judgment entered in the above-entitled cause on February 2, 1956, denying plaintiff's motion for a new trial.

INGMAN & INGMAN,
WILLIAM G. BURGIN, JR.,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks),
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Motion of Plaintiffs to Extend time for Filing Record on Appeal in Appellate Court;

Order entered 4 10 56 Extending time to file Record on Appeal in Appellate Court;

Appellants' Designation of Contents of Record on Appeal;

Appellants' Statement of Points on Appeal;

Appellants' Designation of Record;

Motion of Plaintiffs' for Transmission of Original Depositions with the attached Exhibits to Appellate Court;

Order entered 5/21/56 transmitting Original Depositions and Exhibits in lieu of all copies to Appellate Court;

Appellee's Counter--Designation of Additional Portions of Contents of Record on Appeal;

Order entered 5/29/56 transmitting Original Depositions and Exhibits and Court Files in Lieu of all copies to Appellate Court;

Omitted from the Printed Record, being heretofore copied at pages 109 et seq.

. . . . . .

COMPLAINT.

Filed this 9 day of Dec. 1953.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi.

Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Plaintiff,
v. Civil Action No. 143.
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Count One.

1. The plaintiff is a corporation, incorporated and existing by virtue of the laws of the Territory of Hawaii with its principal office at all times herein mentioned at 808 Fort Street, Honolulu, City and County of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii.

2. The defendant is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its domicile and principal office in Wilmington, Delaware, and having qualified to do business and doing business in the State of Mississippi, and having appointed an agent for the service of process for suits in said state, to wit: J. H. Thompson, in Jackson, Hinds County, Mississippi, upon whom service of process may be had.

3. The matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of Three Thousand Dollars ($3,000.00), exclusive of interest and costs.

4. The jurisdiction of the Court is invoked under Section 1332, Title 28, U. S. Code, June 25, 1948, c

646, 62 Stat. 930; and under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, Chapter 9, Title 21, U. S. Code, June 25, 1938, c. 675, 52 Stat. 1040.

5. During the years 1951 and 1952 and for a number of years prior thereto, the plaintiff has been engaged in and operated within the Territory of Hawaii a wholesale business, including the importation for sale within the said Territory of feed of all kinds for cattle.

6. On or about October 30, 1951, the plaintiff for a fixed consideration, ordered for purchase from The Brode Corporation, incorporated under the laws of the State of Tennessee with its principal office and place of business at 20-6 N. Front Street, 1012 Falls Building, Memphis, Tennessee, two hundred (200) tons of solvent soybean meal sacked in bags of 100 pounds each and the purchase order was accepted, and in confirmance thereof the said Brode Corporation issued at its said principal office under date of October 30, 1951, "Confirmation of Sale."

7. On receipt of the aforesaid order and on the said sale to plaintiff the aforementioned Brode Corporation, for a fixed consideration, placed an order of purchase for the said soybean meal with the Magnolia Soy Products Company, Greenville, Mississippi, with instructions to ship in interstate commerce the said meal from the mill of the company at Greenville, Mississippi, to the plaintiff at designated ports in the Territory of Hawaii, to wit, at Honolulu, Hilo and Port Allen, and the said Magnolia Soy Products Company did pursuant to the aforesaid instructions ship and deliver the said meal.

8. The said soybean meal, extracted with trichloroethylene, as manufactured by the mentioned Magnolia Company was placed at the Company's said mill in burlap bags, each bag containing 100 pounds of the said meal and each having attached the identification tag of the said Magnolia Company; the original bags so identified were received unopened by the plaintiff at said designated ports of the Territory of Hawaii, to wit, at Honolulu, Hilo and Port Allen, and as received were sold and delivered during the latter part of the year 1951 and in the early part of the year 1952, by the plaintiff to purchasers within the said Territory for feed for cattle, the said bags each with the identification tag of the said Magnolia Company remained as originally filled with the said meal and as shipped by the Company until opened by said purchasers for feeding to cattle by them owned in the said Territory and the said purchasers did feed the aforealleged meal to their dairy herds and other cattle with the result that many of the dairy cows and other cattle died and the remainder or part of the remainder became violently ill.

9. The said purchasers for years prior and continuously during the year 1951, the early part of the year 1952 and including the time of the occurrence of the transactions herein alleged purchased from the plaintiff cattle feed, including soybean meal and in all of said purchases the said purchasers relied exclusively on the skill and judgment of the plaintiff in selecting soybean meal of good quality and fit for consumption by cattle and the plaintiff in all of the sales to the purchasers aforementioned knew that any soybean meal purchased was for the sole purpose of feeding it by the purchasers to their dairy herds and other cattle.

10. The said Magnolia Soy Products Company prior to and including the time of the occurrence of the transactions and incidents herein alleged was engaged in the manufacture, distribution and sale of soybean meal, extracted with the chemical solvent trichloroehtylene, for feed for cattle and did during said period manufacture, sell and ship through interstate commerce the said meal for the purpose stated, including that sold, shipped and delivered to the plaintiff as aforesaid.

11. The defendant was engaged, among other activities, in the manufacture, for sale and distribution through interstate commerce, of certain chemical compounds and sold and shipped through interstate commerce, to Magnolia Soy Products Company a chemical solvent, to wit, trichloroethylene, for use in extracting soybean oil from soybeans, then and there well knowing that the soybean meal, from which the soybean oil was to be extracted by use of its product trichloroethylene was to be sold for cattle feed; the defendant at the time of making the sale of the aforesaid chemical solvent to Magnolia Soy Products Company then and there knew, or by the exercise of ordinary care should have known, that soybean meal which had the soybean oil extracted therefrom by the use of the said chemical solvent became unfit for and dangerous as food for cattle, and knew or by the exercise of ordinary care could have known that said solvent, if used for the purpose for which the defendant recommended, sold and delivered it to the Magnolia Soy Products Company for use by the Company in the manner which defendant knew it would be used, would cause the soybean meal to become poisonous to and unfit as food for cattle.

12. The defendant well knew, or should have known, that soybean meal, when processed with its manufactured product trichloroethylene for sale and delivery through interstate commerce for feed for cattle, was toxic and poisonous and would, when fed to cattle including the cattle of the purchasers set out and described in paragraph 8 of this Count One, result in great and serious damage and the defendant, through the sale and delivery of the said solvent for the aforesaid purpose then and there breached its implied warranty that soybean meal so manufactured would be fit and wholesome food for consumption by said purchasers' dairy herds and other cattle. The implied warranty was a material part and condition of the sale transaction and plaintiff relied on said warranty.

13. By reason of said breach of implied warranty, plaintiff has suffered great damage; the damages hereinafter claimed and alleged are damages for losses directly and proximately and naturally resulting in the ordinary course of events from the breach of warranty aforealleged by the defendant; at the time of the sale and delivery aforealleged the defendant well knew, or should have known, that all of the losses hereinafter set forth would directly and proximately result from the said sale and delivery of poisonous and toxic soybean meal; the poisonous and toxic condition of the said meal resulting directly from the use in its processing and manufacturing of trichloroethylene manufactured, sold and delivered by the defendant to the Magnolia Soy Products Company; all losses for which damages are hereinafter claimed were all reasonably foreseeable

14. Plaintiff suffered the following specific and special damages: From suits filed and claims asserted by the aforesaid purchasers of the said soybean meal against the plaintiff, $364,530.92; by reason of expenses and costs in connection with and arising out of the said suits and claims, $100,000.00; and from loss of profits suffered, the loss of profits which will be suffered and loss of good will, $90,000.00.

15. The plaintiff further claims as general damages the sum of $70,000.00. The total of plaintiff's damages, special and general, is $624,530.92.

16. Prior to the filing of this complaint the plaintiff requested and demanded of the defendant payment of damages as aforesaid but defendant has paid no part thereof and refuses to pay the said damages or any part thereof and there is now due and owing to the plaintiff from the defendant the total sum of $624,530.92 by reason of the breach of the aforesaid warranty.

Count Two.

1. Plaintiff reiterates and realleges all of the allegations in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 of Count One hereof.

2. The defendant at the time of the aforementioned sale of and delivery of its manufactured product, the chemical solvent trichloroethylene, to Magnolia Soy Products Company, knowing that the said Company would use the said solvent in extracting oil from soybeans, and that the residual meal sold and shipped in interstate commerce to the plaintiff at designated ports in the Territory of Hawaii, to wit, at Honolulu,

Hilo and Port Allen, and by the plaintiff sold and delivered to the aforesaid purchasers, as set out in Count One of this Complaint, for feed for cattle by them owned, impliedly warranted to all purchasers, including the plaintiff, that the said soybean meal was of merchantable quality; the implied warranty was a material part and condition of the sale transaction and the plaintiff relied on said warranty and the defendant well knew, or should have known, that the soybean meal manufactured through the use of the solvent trichloroethylene for sale and delivery through interstate commerce to the general public and to the plaintiff for sale by the latter within the Territory of Hawaii for feed for cattle, including the cattle owned by the said purchasers was toxic and poisonous and would, when fed to cattle, result in great and serious damage and the defendant at the time of the aforesaid sale and delivery to plaintiff as aforesaid then and there breached its implied warranty of merchantable quality of the said soybean meal, resulting in great damage to the plaintiff.

3. The damages set out and claimed in paragraphs 14 and 15 of Count One hereof are damages for losses directly and proximately and naturally resulting in the ordinary course of events from the breach by defendant of the aforesaid warranty of merchantable quality and were all reasonably foreseeable.

4. Plaintiff reiterates and realleges all of the allegations in paragraphs 14, 15 and 16 of Count One hereof and demands payment of the damages set out in said paragraphs 14 and 15 by reason of the aforesaid breach of the defendant's implied warranty of merchantable quality.

Count Three.

1. Plaintiff reiterates and realleges all of the allegations in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 of Count One hereof.

2. The defendant at the time of the aforementioned sale and at the time the said soybean meal was placed in burlap bags by Magnolia Soy Products Company at its plant at Greenville, Mississippi, for shipment in interstate commerce to plaintiff at designated ports in the Territory of Hawaii, to wit, Honolulu, Hilo and Port Allen, expressly warranted to all purchasers, including the plaintiff, that the contents of the aforementioned burlap bags, the said soybean meal, were of merchantable quality and fit for consumption by cattle and the express warranty was a material part and condition of the sales transaction and plaintiff relied on said warranty and the defendant well knew, or should have known, that the soybean meal manufactured and processed through the use of its chemical solvent trichloroethylene for sale and delivery through interstate commerce to plaintiff for sale within the Territory of Hawaii for feed for cattle, including the cattle of the aforesaid purchasers as set out in Count One of this Complaint, was toxic and poisonous and would, when fed to cattle, result in great and serious damage, and the defendant at the time of the aforesaid sale and delivery to plaintiff then and there breached its express warranty of the merchantable quality and fitness for consumption by cattle of the said soybean meal to the great damage of the plaintiff.

3. The damages set out and claimed in paragraphs 14 and 15 of Count One hereof are damages for losses

directly and proximately and naturally resulting in the ordinary cause of events from the breach by defendant of the aforesaid express warranty of merchantable quality and fitness for consumption by cattle and were all reasonably foreseeable by the defendant.

4. Plaintiff reiterates and realleges all of the allegations in paragraphs 14, 15 and 16 of Count One hereof and demands payment of the damages set forth in said paragraphs 14 and 15 by reason of the aforesaid breach of the defendant's express warranty of merchantable quality and fitness for consumption.

Count Four.

1. Plaintiff reiterates and realleges all of the allegations in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of Count One hereof.

2. That at all times mentioned herein the laws of the Territory of Hawaii, as material herein, provided as follows:

"Chapter 41. Food, Drugs and Cosmetics.

Sec. 2201. Definitions. For the purpose of this part:

(d) 'Food' means (1) articles used for food or drink for man or animals. . . (3) articles used for components of any such article. . .

Sec. 2206. Prohibited acts. The following acts and the causing thereof within the Territory by any person are hereby prohibited: (a) The manufacture, sale, or delivery, holding or offering for sale of any food,

drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded. . . (c) The receipt in commerce of any food, drug, device or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded, and the delivery or proffered delivery thereof for pay or otherwise. . .

Sec. 2209. Foods demmed to be adulterated when. A food shall be deemed to be adulterated: (a)(1) If it bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render it injurious to health; but in case the substance is not an added substance such food shall not be considered adulterated under this clause if the quantity of such substance in such food does not ordinarily render it injurious to health; or (2) if it bears or contains any added poisonous or added deleterious substance which is unsafe within the meaning of section 2213; or (3) if it consists in whole or in part of a diseased, contaminated, filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance, or if it is otherwise unfit for food; or (4) if it has been produced, prepared, packed, or held under insanitary conditions whereby it may have become contaminated with filth, or whereby it may have been rendered diseased, unwholesome or injurious to health; . . .

3. That at all times mentioned herein the laws of the United States, as material herein, provided as follows:

Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (Vol. 5, FCA, Title 21)

"Sec. 321. Definitions; generally

(f) The term 'food' means (1) articles used for food or drink for man or other animals. . . .(3) articles used for components of any such article.

"Sec. 331. Prohibited acts.

The following acts and the causing thereof are hereby prohibited:

(a) The introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded.

(b) The adulteration or misbranding of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic in interstate commerce.

(c) The receipt in interstate commerce of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded, and the delivery or proffered delivery thereof for pay or otherwise. . ."

That the definition of adulterated food is the same as that recited above with relation to the laws of the Territory of Hawaii.

4. On or about October 30, 1951, the plaintiff for a fixed consideration ordered for purchase from The Brode Corporation, incorporated under the laws of the State of Tennessee with its principal office and place of business at 20—6 N. Front Street, 1012 Falls Building, Memphis, Tennessee, two hundred (200) tons of solvent soybean meal sacked in bags of one hundred pounds each, and the purchase order was accepted and in confirmation thereof the said Brode Corporation issued at Memphis, Tennessee, under date of October 30, 1951, "Confirmation of Sale" to the plaintiff.

5. On receipt of the aforesaid order from and on the said sale to plaintiff the aforementioned Brode

Corporation, for a fixed consideration placed an order of purchase for the said two hundred (200) tons of soybean meal with the defendant with instructions to the defendant to ship in interstate commerce the said meal from its mill at Greenville, Mississippi, to the plaintiff at designated ports in the Territory of Hawaii to wit, Honolulu, Hilo and Port Allen, and the defendant did pursuant to the aforesaid instructions ship and deliver the said meal.

6. The defendant was engaged, among other activities in the manufacture, for sale and distribution through interstate commerce, of certain chemical compounds and sold and shipped through interstate commerce to Magnolia Soy Products Company a chemical solvent, to wit, trichloroethylene, for use in extracting soybean oil from soybeans, then and there well knowing that the soybean meal, from which the soybean oil was to be extracted by use of its product trichloroethylene was to be sold for cattle feed; the defendant at the time of making the sale of the aforesaid chemical solvent to Magnolia Soy Products Company then and there knew, or by the exercise of ordinary care could have known, that soybean meal which had the soybean oil extracted therefrom by the use of the said chemical solvent became unfit for and dangerous as food for cattle, and knew or by the exercise of ordinary care could have known that said solvent, if used for the purpose for which the defendant recommended, sold and delivered it to the Magnolia Soy Products Company for use by the Company in the manner which defedant knew it would be used, would cause the soybean meal to become poisonous to and unfit as food for cattle, the defendant knew that the chemical solvent, trichloroethylene had caused death and injury to cattle when used for

the aforesaid purpose at numerous previous times and would in this instance.

7. The defendant, at the time of the sale of the chemical solvent and the delivery through interstate commerce to Magnolia Soy Products Company or at any time thereafter, failed and neglected to inform the said Company, the plaintiff or the general public that the aforesaid chemical solvent when used to extract soybean oil made the residual soybean meal poisonous and injurious to and unfit and unsound as food for cattle, the defendant owed a duty to do so and the failure to perform this duty constituted negligence.

8. The defendant recommended the use of and sold and distributed trichloroethylene through interstate commerce as a solvent to remove soybean oil from soybean meal, knowing that the residual meal was to be used as cattle food, knowing, or the defendant should have known, at the time of the sale and delivery of the trichloroethylene to Magnolia Soy Products Company that the Company would process, manufacture, market and distribute, through interstate commerce, to the general public the residual meal for use as cattle food and the said Company did manufacture, sell and distribute to the general public, including the plaintiff, soybean meal so processed with the aforesaid solvent, the defendant having knowledge or imputed knowledge of the dangerous qualities of the solvent trichloroethylene.

9. The defendant having knowledge or being chargeable with knowledge, of the use to be made by the Magnolia Soy Products Company of the de-

fendant's product trichloroethylene, the sale and distribution through interstate commerce of the residual meal and the danger to cattle of the meal when so processed as food for cattle, a duty arose on the part of the defendant to perform and carry out such test as would make certain that the aforesaid soybean meal would not be unfit, unsound and injurious to cattle when to them fed. This duty the defendant failed to perform, thus the defendant is guilty of negligence.

10. The soybean meal, the contents of the aforesaid burlap bags, was processed or manufactured through and by the use of solvent trichloroethylene, a product manufactured by and sold and delivered through interstate commerce by the defendant to the said Magnolia Soy Products Company. The said soybean meal so manufactured was highly toxic and poisonous and after delivery as aforesaid to plaintiff, and by plaintiff sold to the aforesaid purchasers set out in Count One of this Complaint and by the said purchasers fed, after delivery, to their dairy herds and other cattle by them owned, many of the dairy cows and other cattle died and the remainder or part of the remainder became violently ill.

11. The defendant, the manufacturer of the chemical trichloroethylene, knew, or should have known, that the trichloroethylene would be used for the stated purpose by the said Magnolia Soy Products Company, knew, or should have known, that the soybean meal resulting from the use of the said chemical would be sold and delivered through interstate commerce for feed for cattle and knew, or should have known, that the residual meal so processed was toxic and poison-

ous ard would, when fed to cattle, cause serious illness and death to cattle; notwithstanding such knowledge or imputed knowledge the defendant carelessly and negligently manufactured and delivered, as aforesaid the said chemical thereby and by reason thereof all and every injury of the plaintiff arising out of and by reason of the deaths and illnesses of the aforesaid cattle, as set forth in this complaint, were directly and proximately caused by the sale and use of the said trichloroethylene in the processing of soybeans resulting in the said poisonous and toxic meal.

12. There was a duty on the part of the defendant under the conditions and circumstances aforealleged to use reasonable care not to ship and deliver through interstate commerce the said trichloroethylene for use in the manufacture of soybean meal for feed for cattle, including the cattle of the aforesaid purchasers; the failure of the defendant to exercise due care constituted negligence.

13. Plaintiff reiterates and realleges all of the allegations in paragraphs 14, 15 and 16 of Count One hereof.

14. By reason of said negligence the plaintiff suffered great damage; the damages claimed are set out in paragraphs 14 and 15 of Count One hereof and are damages for losses directly and proximately and naturally resulting in the ordinary course of events from the negligence of the defendant as aforesaid, in that defendant well knew, or should have known, at the time of the said delivery of the aforesaid meal that it would be, from the use of the defendant's manufactured chemical trichloroethylene, poisonous

and toxic; that all of the losses aforesaid would directly and proximately result, for all of the losses for which damages are claimed as aforealleged were reasonably foreseeable.

15. The transaction upon which this cause of action is based is the same transaction alleged in Counts One, Two and Three of this Complaint.

Wherefore, the plaintiff demands judgment against the defendant in the sum of Six Hundred Twenty Four Thousand Five Hundred Thirty Dollars and Ninety-two Cents ($624,530.92).

PRATT, TAVARES & CASSIDY,
Alexander & Baldwin Building,
Honolulu, Hawaii.

ROGER E. BROOKS,
By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks),
Attorneys for Plaintiff.

923—20th Street, N. W.,
Washington, D. C.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL.

The plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues.
ROGER E. BROOKS.

ANSWER OF E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & COMPANY, DEFENDANT.

Filed this 14 day of Jan. 1954.

United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Plaintiff,
v. Civil Action No. 143.
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, Defendant.

Now comes E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, (hereinafter, for the sake of brevity, sometimes referred to variously as "Defendant," "this Defendant" or "du Pont"), the Defendant in the above entitled and numbered action, and files this, its Answer to the Complaint herein.

Answer to Count One.

First Defense.

Count One of the Complaint fails to state a claim against this Defendant upon which relief can be granted.

Second Defense.

Now responding to, and following the same numbering of paragraphs of, Count One of the Complaint, Defendant answers and says:

1.

Defendant alleges that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 1 of Count One of the Complaint, and, therefore, the allegations of said paragraph of Count One are denied.

2 and 3.

Defendant admits the allegations contained in paragraphs 2 and 3 of said Count One of the Complaint.

4.

Defendant admits that Plaintiff claims and invokes jurisdiction of this Court under the code sections and Acts of Congress referred to in paragraph 4 of Count One of the Complaint, but Defendant denies that this Honorable Court has jurisdiction of either the subject matter or the parties.

5-10 inclusive.

Defendant alleges that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of Count One of the Complaint, and, therefore, each and every allegation contained in all of

said paragraphs in Count One of the Complaint are denied.

11.

Defendant denies each and every allegation of paragraph 11 of Count One of the Complaint, except Defendant admits that it was engaged, among other activities, in the manufacture, for sale and distribution through interstate commerce, of certain chemical compounds and sold and shipped through interstate commerce, to Magnolia Soy Products Company, a chemical solvent, to-wit: trichloroethylene, for use in extracting soybean oil from soybeans.

12 and 13.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 12 and 13 of Count One of the Complaint.

14 and 15.

For answer to paragraphs 14 and 15 of Count One of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraphs 14 and 15 of said Count One, as to alleged damages or losses from suits filed and claims asserted by purchasers of soybean meal against Plaintiff, losses as to expenses and costs in connection with or arising out of said suits and claims, loss of profits allegedly suffered or to be suffered, loss of good will, and further general damages, and therefore, all allegations of Plaintiff in said paragraphs 14 and 15 are denied.

Defendant denies that any and all such alleged losses referred to in paragraphs 14 and 15 of Count One were the result of any negligence of the Defendant, or any act, or failure to act, or violation of any duty, by the Defendant.

16.

Defendant admits that Plaintiff has made demand upon it prior to the filing of this Complaint for payment of $624,530.92, and admits that Defendant has paid no part thereof and that Defendant has refused to pay said sum or any part thereof; but Defendant denies each and every other allegation contained in said paragraph 16 of Count One of the Complaint.

Answer to Count Two.

First Defense.

Count Two fails to state a claim against this Defendant upon which relief can be granted.

Second Defense.

Now responding to, and following the same numbering of paragraphs of, Count Two of the Complaint, Defendant answers and says:

1.

Defendant, for its answer to paragraph 1 of Count Two of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates and adopts its answers to paragraphs 1 to 11, both inclusive, of Count One of the Complaint.

2 and 3.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 2 and 3 of Count Two of the Complaint.

4.

Defendant, for its answer to paragraph 4 of said Count Two of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates and adopts its answer to paragraphs 14, 15 and 16 of Count One of the Complaint, and denies the remainder of said paragraph 4 of Count Two of the Complaint.

Answer to Count Three.

First Defense.

Count Three of the Complaint fails to state a claim against this Defendant upon which relief can be granted.

Second Defense.

Now responding to, and following the same numbering of paragraphs of, Count Three of the Complaint, Defendant answers and says:

1.

Defendant, for its answer to paragraph 1 of Count Three of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates and adopts its answers to paragraphs 1 to 11, both inclusive, of Count One of the Complaint.

2 and 3.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 2 and 3 of Count Three of the Complaint.

4.

Defendant, for its answer to paragraph 4 of Count Three of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates and adopts its answers to paragraphs 14, 15 and 16 of Count One of the Complaint, and denies the remainder of paragraph 4 of Count Three of the Complaint.

Answer to Count Four.

First Defense.

Count Four of the Complaint fails to state a claim against this Defendant upon which relief can be granted.

Second Defense.

Now responding to, and following the same numbering of paragraphs of, Count Four of the Complaint, Defendant answers and says:

1.

Defendant, for its answer to paragraph 1 of Count Four of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates and adopts its answers to paragraphs 1 to 10, both inclusive, of Count One of the Complaint.

2 and 3.

Inasmuch as paragraphs 2 and 3 of Count Four of the Complaint allege the existence, not of facts, but of statutory law of the Territory of Hawaii and the United States, no answer thereto is required.

4.

Defendant alleges that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 4 of Count Four of the Complaint, and, therefore, the allegations in said paragraph 4 of the said Count are denied.

5.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 5 of Count 4 of the Complaint

6.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 6 of Count Four of the Complaint except Defendant admits that it was engaged among other activities in the manufacture, for sale and distribution through interstate commerce, of certain chemical compounds and sold and shipped through interstate commerce to Magnolia Soy Products Company, a chemical solvent, to-wit: trichloroethylene for use in extracting soybean oil from soybeans.

7.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 7 of Count Four of the Complaint

8.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 8 of Count Four of the Complaint.

9-11, inclusive.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 9, 10 and 11 of Count Four of the Complaint.

12.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 12 of Count Four of the Complaint. It is further specifically denied that any negligence of Defendant (which negligence is denied) was in any way related to or connected with any damage to Plaintiff and denies that Defendant violated, or failed to perform, any duty owed to the Plaintiff.

13.

Defendant, for answer to paragraph 13 of Count Four of the Complaint, hereby repeats, reiterates and adopts its answers to paragraphs 14, 15 and 16 of Count One of the Complaint.

14.

Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 14 of Count Four of the Complaint.

15.

While this paragraph is nothing more than the conclusion of the pleader to which no answer is required,

nevertheless, insofar as the same might be deemed proper pleading, the allegations of said paragraph 15 of Count Four of the Complaint are denied.

Third Defense.

For a third and further defense to the Complaint herein, and to each of the four Counts therein, Defendant alleges that this Court lacks jurisdiction over the person of this Defendant in that this Defendant is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware and was not and is not subject to service of process within the Northern District of Mississippi.

Fourth Defense.

For a fourth and further defense to the Complaint herein, and to each of the four Counts therein, Defendant alleges that this Court lacks jurisdiction of the subject matter in that the Plaintiff is a citizen and resident of the Territory of Hawaii and Defendant is a citizen and resident of the State of Delaware, under the laws of which it was and is organized and wherein it has its domicile, the said Defendant not being subject to service of process in the Northern District of Mississippi, and no alleged cause of action accrued unto Plaintiff in the Northern District of Mississippi, and no act or omission of this Defendant is alleged to have occurred or been made in the Northern District of Mississippi.

Fifth Defense

For a fifth and further defense to the Complaint herein, and to each of the four Counts therein, De-

fendant alleges that the venue of this action does not lie in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, or the Greenville Division therein, but, on the contrary, venue lies, if the suit is maintainable at all, in the United States District Court for the Jackson Division of the Southern District of Mississippi.

And now having answered the Complaint, and each and every Count therein, Defendant prays to be dismissed with costs.

W. C. WELLS, III,
EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas),
Attorneys for Defendant.

CARL E. GEUTHER,
Address of each of above:
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi.

7058 Du Pont Building,
Wilmington, Delaware.
WALTER D. FORD,
7055-A Du Pont Building,
Wilmington, Delaware.

WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi,
Of Counsel.

Affidavit of Service.

State of Mississippi.
County of Hinds.

Earl T. Thomas, being by me first duly sworn, states on oath that he has served the foregoing An-

swer on counsel for Plaintiff, by mailing this date, postage prepaid, true copies thereof respectively, to Pratt, Tavares & Cassidy, Esqs., Alexander & Baldwin Building, Honolulu, Hawaii, Roger E. Brooks, Esq., 923-20th Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. and Wm. G. Burgin, Jr., Esq., Columbus, Mississippi, Attorneys for the Plaintiff.

EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas).

Sworn to and subscribed before me, this January 13th, 1954.

JEWELL BEARD,
(Seal) Notary Public.

My Commission Expires Nov. 4, 1955.

Motion of Defendant for Summary Judgment;

Notice of Hearing on above motion;

Affidavit of Clerk B. Shepherd, dated 9 21 54;

Affidavit of R. Stuart Armstrong, dated 9 21 54;

Exhibit "A"—Opinion rendered by the Supreme Court of Miss., in Case E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co., vs. Frank Ladner, Case No. 39,116;

Exhibit "B"—Letter, E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co., to Lyman Reed, Mgr., Magnolia Soy Products Co., dated 7 31 51;

Affidavit of Charles A. Cline, Jr., dated 9/29/54;

Order entered 1/18/55 Denying Motion of Defendant for Summary Judgment;

Memorandum relative to Motion for Consolidation, etc.;

Omitted from the Printed Record, being heretofore copied at pages 54 et seq.

* * * * * * * *

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi.

Filed this 3 day of June 1954.

Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Plaintiff,
v. Civil Action No. 143.
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Counsel for plaintiff and defendant in the above-captioned cause stipulate that the depositions of Elmer Sokei, Walter Friedlander and Dr. Rex Glaysier to be taken on June 10, 1954, at Lihue, Kauai, Territory of Hawaii, by Winston C. Ingman, Esquire, in the matter of Ryoju Sokei v. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, who will note his appearance as counsel for the plaintiff, may be used by plaintiff in this cause in the same manner and to the same extent said depositions could be used if taken by the plaintiff, Fred L. Waldron, Limited, sub-

ject to the procedure established by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

PRATT, TAVARES & CASSIDY,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks),
Attorneys for Plaintiff.

WM. G. BURGIN, JR.,
(Wm. G. Burgin, Jr.).

WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
CARL E. GEUTHER,
WALTER D. FORD,
By CARL E. GEUTHER,
Attorneys for Defendant.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi.

Filed this 3 day of June 1954.

Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Plaintiff,
v. Civil Action No. 143.
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Counsel for plaintiff and defendant in the above-captioned cause hereby stipulate that the depositions of S. Yama, Frank Fernandez, and James E. Nishida to be taken on June 9, 1954, at Lhue, Kauai, Territory of Hawaii, by Shiro Kashiwa, Esquire, in the matter of George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as the Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, v. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company,

a corporation, who will note his appearance as counsel for the plaintiff, may be used by plaintiff in this cause in the same manner and to the same extent said depositions could be used if taken by the plaintiff, Fred L. Waldron, Limited, subject to the procedures established by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

PRATT, TAVARES & CASSIDY,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks),
Attorneys for Plaintiff.

WM. G. BURGIN, JR.,
(Wm. G. Burgin, Jr.).

WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
CARL E. GEUTHER,
WALTER D. FORD,
By CARL E. GEUTHER,
Attorneys for Defendant.

STIPULATION.

Filed this 28 day of July 1955.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Oxford Division.

Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Plaintiff,
v. Civil No. 143.
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendants.

Counsel for plaintiffs and defendant in the above-entitled cause hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

That the plaintiff subject to, and only to, such objections as would be available to the defendant to the originals, may tender in evidence at the trial of this cause copies of original documents received by the defendant from Magnolia Soy Products Company, L. L. Ford, L. L. Ford Associates, Lyman Reed, Allen Jackson, O. H. Sale, James M. Warren and Davidson-Kennedy Company, set out and described in the Answer and Additional and Supplemental Answers of defendant in reply to Interrogatories of the plaintiff of record in this cause, said copies to be of the same force and effect for all purposes as the original documents would be, if offered and admitted in evidence.

Dated this 11th day of July, 1955.

PRATT, TAVARES & CASSIDY,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks),
Attorneys for Plaintiff.
WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
CARL E. GEUTHER,
WALTER D. FORD,
By EARL T. THOMAS,
Attorneys for Defendant

Memorandum as to Verdict;

Motion of Plaintiff for New Trial;

Order entered 2 2 56 Denying Motion of Plaintiff for New Trial;

Judgment entered 12 2 55;

Omitted from the Printed Record, being heretofore copied at pages 98 et seq.

. . . . . .

NOTICE OF APPEAL.

Filed this 1 day of March 1956.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Plaintiff,
v. Civil Action No. 143
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Plaintiff, Fred L. Waldron, Limited, herein and hereby appeals to the United States District Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit from the judgment entered in the above-entitled cause on February 2, 1956, denying plaintiff's motion for a new trial.

PRATT, TAVARES & CASSIDY,
WILLIAM G. BURGIN, JR.,
ROGER E. BROOKS,
By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks),
Attorney for Plaintiff

Motion of Plaintiffs to Extend Time for Filing Record on Appeal in Appellate Court;

Order entered 4 10 56 Extending time to file Record on Appeal in Appellate Court;

Appellants' Designation of Contents of Record on Appeal;

Appellants' Statement of Points on Appeal;

Appellants' Designation of Record;

Motion of Plaintiffs' for transmission of Original Depositions with the attached Exhibits to Appellate Court;

Order entered 5/21/56 transmitting Original Depositions and Exhibits in lieu of all copies to Appellate Court;

Appellee's Counter-Designation of additional portions of Contents of Record on Appeal;

Order entered 5 29 56 transmitting Original Depositions and Exhibits and Court Files in lieu of all copies to Appellate Court;

Omitted from the Printed Record, being heretofore copied at pages 109 et seq

. . . . . .

PLAINTIFFS' REQUEST FOR INSTRUCTIONS.

In he United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. Civil Action No. 142

E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Company, Defendant.

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,

v. Civil Action No. 145

E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Plaintiff,

v. Civil Action No. 143

E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Company, a Corporation, Defendant.

Come now plaintiffs above mentioned and hereby respectfully request that the following instructions No. 1 to No. 20 be given to the jury in the above-entitled causes.

Dated: November 29th, 1955.

PRATT, TAVARES & CASSIDY, SHIRO KASHIWA, INGMAN & INGMAN, WILLIAM G. BURGIN, JR., ROGER E. BROOKS,

By ROGER E. BROOKS,
(Roger E. Brooks),
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Plaintiffs' No. 1.

The Court instructs the jury that throughout these instructions, to follow, unless it is specifically stated in any instruction that it applies only to a particular case mentioned, the instruction applies to all three cases.

Plaintiffs' No. 2.

The Court instructs the jury that the care of a prudent man varies according to circumstances dependent upon the degree of danger. What is the precise legal intent of the term "ordinary care" must, in the nature of things, depend upon the circumstances of each individual case. It is a relative and not an absolute term. The degree of care and foresight which is necessary in any given case must always be in proportion to the nature and magnitude of the injuries and damages which might result from the occurrence which is to be anticipated and guarded against.

Plaintiffs' No. 3.

The Court instructs the jury that under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act the causing of the introduction into interstate commerce of soy bean oil meal which is known to be intended for cattle feed and which is unfit for cattle feed is prohibited.

The said Act further prohibits the shipment in interstate commerce of tri solvent which the sender knows may become a component part of feed that is unfit for cattle and is intended to be sold for cattle feed.

The said Act further prohibits the shipment of tri solvent in interstate commerce unless the container thereof bears a label specifically informing prospective users as to its safe use.

The material provisions of this Act are attached to this instruction.

The Court instructs the jury that the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act provides, as material herein, as follows:

"Sec. 31. The following acts and the causing thereof are hereby prohibited:

(a) The introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of any food, drug, device or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded.

(b) The adultration or misbranding of any food, drug, device or cosmetic in interstate commerce.

(c) The receipt in interstate commerce of any food, drug, device or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded and the delivery or proffered delivery thereof for pay or otherwise

(d) —

"Sec. 201. For the purposes of this Act —

(a) The term 'Territory' means any Territory or possession of the United States—

(b) The term "interstate commerce" means (1) commerce between any state or territory—.

(e) The term "person" includes individual partnership, corporation—.

(f) The term 'food' means (1) articles used for food or drink for man or other animals (2) chewing gum, and (3) articles used for components of any such article.

(g) The term "drug" means (1) articles recognized in the official United States Pharmacopcia.

(k) The term "label" means a display of written, pr nted or graphic matter upon the immediate container of any article; and a requirement made by or under authority of this act that any word, statement or other information appearing on the label shall not be considered to be complied with unless such word, statement, or other information also appears on the outside container or wrapper, if any there be, of the retail package of such article, or is easily legible through the outside container or wrapper.

(m) The term "labeling" means all label and other written, printed or graphic matter (1) upon any article or any of its containers or wrappers, or (2) accompanying such article.

(n) If an article is alleged to be misbranded because the labeling is misleading, then in determining whether the labeling is misleading there shall be taken into account (among other things) not representations made or suggested by statement, word,

design, device, or any combination thereof, but also the extent to which the labeling fails to reveal facts material in the light of such representations or material with respect to consequences which may result from the use of the article to which the labeling relates under the conditions of use prescribed in labeling thereof or under such conditions of use as are customary or usual.

(p) The term "new drug" means—

(1) Any drug the composition of which is such that such drug is not generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of drugs, as safe for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling thereof, except that such a drug not so recognized shall not be deemed to be a "new drug" if at any time prior to the enactment of this Act it was subject to the Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, as amended, and if at such time its labeling contained the same representations concerning the conditions of its use—

Sec. 303.(a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of section 301 shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall on conviction thereof be subject to imprisonment for not more than one year, or a fine of not more than $1,000, or both such imprisonment and fine; but if the violation is committed after a conviction of such person under this section has become final such person shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than three years, or a fine of not more than $10,000, or both imprisonment and fine.

Sec. 402. A food shall be deemed to be adulterated—(a)(1) If it bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render it injurious to health; but in case the substance is not an added substance such food shall not be considréd adulterated under this clause if the quantity of such substance in such food does not ordinarily render it injurious to health; or (2) if it bears or contains any added poisonous or added deleterious substance which is unsafe within the meaning of section 406; (406(a) reads as follows:

Sec. 406. (a) Any poisonous or deleterious substance added to any food, except where such substance is required in the production thereof or cannot be avoided by good manufacturing practice shall be deemed to be unsafe for purposes of the application of clause (2) of section 402(a);)

or (3) if it consists in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance, or if it is otherwise unfit for food; or (4) if it has been prepared, packed, or held, under insanitary conditions whereby it may have become contaminated with filth, or whereby it may have been rendered injurious to health;—

Sec. 403. A food shall be deemed to be misbranded—(a) If its labeling is false or misleading in any particular. (f) If any word, statement, or other information required by or under authority of this Act to appear on the label or labeling is not prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the labeling) and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the

ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use.

Sec. 502. A drug or device shall be deemed to be misbranded—(a) If its labeling is false or misleading in any particular. (c) If any word, statement, or other information required by or under authority of this Act to appear on the label or labeling is not prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the labeling) and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use. (f) Unless its labeling bears (1) adequate directions for use;—(j) If it is dangerous to health when used in the dosage, or with the frequency or duration prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling thereof.

Sec. 505(a) No person shall introduce or deliver for introduction into interstate commerce any new drug, unless an application filed pursuant to subsection (b) is effective with respect to such drug.

(b) Any person may file with the Secretary an application with respect to any drug subject to the provisions of subsection (a). Such persons shall submit to the Secretary as a part of the application (1) full reports of investigations which have been made to show whether or not such drug is safe for use; (2) a full list of the articles used as components of such drug; (a) a full statement of the composition of such drug; (4) a full description of the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing and packing of such drug;

(5) such samples of such drug and of the articles used as components thereof as the Secretary may require; and (6) specimens of the labeling proposed to be used for such drug.

(c) An application provided for in subsection (b) shall become effective on the sixtieth day after the filing thereof unless prior to such day the Secretary by notice to the applicant in writing postpones the effective date of the application to such time (not more than one hundred and eighty days after the filing thereof) as the Secretary deems necessary to enable him to study and investigate the application.

Plaintiffs' No. 4.

The Court instructs the jury that if you find by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant, in shipping tri solvent in interstate commerce to Magnolia Soy Products Company in the manner and at the times shown by the evidence violated the Federal Pure Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, then by reason of such violation, the defendant was guilty of negligence as a matter of law in so shipping such tri solvent, and, unless you further find that the defendant was exonerated by an intervening cause, as covered by other instructions, then your verdict should be for the plaintiffs.

Plaintiffs' No. 5.

The Court instructs the jury that if you find by a preponderance of the evidence that, in or as a result of shipping tri solvent in interstate commerce to Magnolia Soy Products Company, the defendant vio-

lated any provision of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, such violation is evidence, to be considered with all other evidence to determine whether the defendant was negligent in such shipping of tri solvent.

Plaintiffs' No. 6.

The Court instructs the jury that the Hawaii Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, of the Territory of Hawaii, provides that the causing of the sale, delivery or receipt in the Territory of Hawaii of feed which is known to be intended to be sold for cattle feed and which is unfit for consumption by cattle is prohibited. If you find from a preponderance of the evidence that Magnolia Soy Products Company, hereinafter called Magnolia, was engaged in the business of manufacturing soy bean oil meal using the tri process, and that the defendant sold tri solvent to Magnolia with knowledge that Magnolia would manufacture such meal and sell the same in interstate commerce for use as cattle feed, and that the defendant knew, or by the exercise of due care should have known, that such meal when eaten by cattle was toxic to them, and that the defendant did not, before the meal involved in each suit was shipped to the Territory of Hawaii, adequately warn Magnolia that such meal might be toxic to cattle and did not label its tri solvent when sold to Magnolia in such manner as to indicate that such meal manufactured therewith would be toxic to cattle if eaten by them, and if you further find that the meal which was shipped from Magnolia was the proximate cause of the cattle deaths and illnesses claimed by the respective plaintiff or plaintiffs in the suit, such action on the part

of the defendant would be a violation of the Hawaii Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, and such a violation, if so found by you, would be evidence of negligence on the part of the defendant.

Plaintiffs' No. 7.

The Court instructs the jury the proximate cause of an event must be understood to be that which in a natural sequence, unbroken by any new unforseeable intervening cause, produced that event and without which the event would not have happened.

Plaintiffs' No. 8.

The Court instructs the jury that a new and independent cause is an intervening efficient force which breaks the casual connection between the original wrong and the injury. Such new force must be sufficient of itself to stand as the cause of the injury and be one but for which the injury would not have occurred. The term "new" refers to and means a cause incapable of being reasonably foreseen by the original wrongdoer by the use of ordinary care on his part; and the word "independent" refers to and means the absence of the relation of cause and effect between the new cause and the original wrongful act or omission. And, unless the intervening cause is both new and independent, sufficient of itself to stand as the cause of the injury, breaking the causal connection, the original wrongdoer is not relieved from the legal responsibility for his wrong or negligence.

Plaintiffs' No. 9.

The Court instructs the jury that if you find that defendant du Pont induced Magnolia Soy Products Company (sometimes called "Magnolia" in these instructions), or the predecessors in interest of Magnolia, or both, to construct a tri-process mill for the manufacture of soy bean oil meal for sale as cattle feed, upon the representation by defendant that the tri-process would produce soy bean oil meal that would be fit for cattle feed and not toxic to cattle; and if you further find that the defendant was negligent in so doing; and if you further find that the damages to the plaintiffs were caused by the subsequent acts of Magnolia in manufacturing and selling such meal; then such subsequent acts of Magnolia would not be a sufficient intervening cause to discharge the defendant from liability for its negligence if:

(a) du Pont at the time of its negligent acts should have realized that Magnolia would so act; or

(b) a reasonable man, knowing the situation existing when Magnolia's acts causing the injury to plaintiffs took place, would not regard Magnolia's said actions as highly extraordinary; or

(c) Magnolia's acts which caused the injuries to plaintiffs were a normal response to a situation created by du Pont's conduct and the manner in which Magnolia acted was not extraordinarily negligent.

Plaintiffs' No. 10.

The Court instructs the jury that an intervening act of a third person, negligent in itself, is not a superseding cause of injury to another which the actor's negligent conduct is a substantial factor in bringing about, if (a) the actor at the time of his negligent conduct should have realized that a third person might so act, or (b) a reasonably prudent man knowing the existing situation when the act of the third person was done would not regard it as highly extraordinary that the third person should so act. Therefore, if you find from a preponderance of the evidence that the construction of the mill of the Magnolia Soy Products Company as a mill designed to use only the trichloroethylene process of extraction was negligently induced by the defendant through representations that the trichloroethylene process would produce soy bean oil meal fit for cattle feed; that the defendant sold tri solvent to the Magnolia Soy Products Company knowing that it was to be used by that Company to manufacture soy bean oil meal for sale in interstate commerce as cattle feed; and that the actions of the defendant prior to the sale of the soy bean oil meal which was ultimately purchased by plaintiffs and used in feeding their cattle, or prior to the time when they received the same in the Territory of Hawaii, were not such as would have caused a reasonably prudent man to desist from selling such meal for cattle feed, or were such that a reasonably prudent man in the position of the defendant knew or should have known that the said Company would continue to sell such meal in interstate commerce for cattle feed and would not have regarded sale of tri meal for cattle feed by said

Company as highly extraordinary under the circumstances, then your verdict should be for the plaintiffs.

Plaintiffs' No. 11.

With respect to the claim made by the defendant that the acts of a third person (namely, Magnolia Soy Products Company) intervened between the commission of any act or acts of the defendant that might be considered negligent and the actual occurrence of the damages claimed by each of the plaintiffs, the Court instructs the jury that, if you find that a reasonable person in the situation of defendant would or should have realized that there was a realizable likelihood that said Company would act in a particular manner, and that this was the hazard or one of the hazards which made the defendant negligent in act or acts, then such intervening acts, whether innocent, negligent, intentionally tortious or criminal, does not or do not prevent the defendant from being liable to plaintiff or plaintiffs.

Plaintiffs' No. 12.

The Court instructs the jury that, where a manufacturer of an article knows, or in the exercise of ordinary care should know, that such article will be put to a certain use and that such use will create unusual hazards, there arises a duty on the part of such manufacturer to adequately warn all those who may reasonably be expected to be injured or damaged by a lack of such adequate warning. Whether any warning, if given, is adequate, is a question of fact for the jury to decide under all the circum-

stances. If, therefore, you find that a reasonably prudent person under the circumstances the defendant was in, would have warned not only Magnolia Soy Products Company but all classes of persons each of the plaintiffs was situated in, and no such warning was given by defendant to plaintiffs nor was any reasonable effort made by defendant to warn persons generally in such situation of each of the plaintiffs, such an act of omission is evidence of negligence on the part of the defendant.

Plaintiffs' No. 13.

The Court instructs the jury that the question of whether the letter of July 31, 1951, all plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 35, delivered by Stuart Armstrong to L. L. Ford and Lyman Reed of Magnolia Soy Products Company on or about August 2nd or 3rd, 1951, was adequate notice to that Company so as to prevent the defendant from being liable to plaintiffs for any negligent acts (if you find that the defendant did commit such negligent acts), is a question of fact to be decided by the jury in the light of all of the circumstances as found by you. These circumstances may include any circumstances which you find would have influenced a reasonably prudent man in the same situation as the Magnolia Company in determining whether or not the situation required or justified his ceasing immediately to make any further sales of tri-processed soy bean meal for purposes of cattle feed, and may include circumstances and happenings prior to, at the time of, or a reasonable time subsequent to, the delivery of that letter and before the shipping by the Magnolia Company of any of the meal that caused the damage to the plaintiff or plain-

tiffs (if you find that such damage was caused by such meal). The question, so far as the Magnolia Company was concerned, is what a reasonable person would have understood the letter to mean under all of the relevant circumstances as so found by you.

Plaintiffs' No. 14.

The Court instructs the jury that where a manufacturer supplies an article which he manufactures or produces, to be used for a particular purpose under such circumstances that the buyer necessarily trusts to or relies upon the judgment and skill of such manufacturer to furnish an article of that type that is fit for the particular purpose, there is an implied warranty that such article shall be fit for said purpose for which it is to be used. There is also an implied warranty, under such circumstances, that the article is merchantable for such purpose.

Plaintiffs' No. 15.

The Court instructs the jury that the implied warranty of a manufacturer of fitness for a particular use or of merchantability for such use, is not only to the immediate buyer of the article, but for the benefit of all persons whom defendant reasonably forsaw, or should reasonably have foreseen, might be injured if the product did not measure up to the quality as warranted and such party, if injured or damaged by such failure to conform to the warranted quality, may have a remedy for breach of warranty against the manufacturer.

Plaintiffs' No. 16.

The Court instructs the jury that if concurrent or successive negligence of two persons combined results in injury to a third person, he may recover of either or both.

Plaintiffs' No. 17.

The Court instructs the jury that the measure of damages for loss of or injury to cattle is the difference between the reasonable market value immediately before the injury or loss and the reasonable market values immediately after the injury or loss.

Plaintiffs' No. 18.

The Court instructs the jury that, if your verdict is in favor of a particular plaintiff, that plaintiff is entitled to damages, if any, caused by way of death of cows, calves, injury or damage to cows or calves, loss of profits, if any, loss of customers, if any, loss of good will, if any, reasonable cost of drugs and veterinary services, if any, other expenses, if any, reasonably and necessarily incurred in connection with and as a result of the illness or death of cows and calves, or in making reasonable efforts to ascertain the cause of the cattle illnesses and deaths, or to minimize damages, or to protect the herds and businesses of the respective plaintiffs, or any combination of said expenses, which damages, losses, and expenses the jury finds to have proximately resulted from or been caused by the defendant's wrongful act or acts.

Plaintiffs' No. 19.

The Court instructs the jury that, although these three cass, namely, (1) Nishida v. du Pont, Civil Action No. 142, (2) Sokei v. du Pont, Civil Action No. 145, and (3) Waldron v. du Pont, Civil Action No. 143, have been consolidated for trial, you are to bring in separate verdicts in each action. Forms of verdict will be handed you by the Court, in each action, for each count in that action, and you will render your verdict on each such count in such manner as the facts as found by you and the law as given you by the Court may warrant. The Court will now explain the reason for submitting to you several counts in each action. The Rules of Civil Procedure of this Court permit a plaintiff, when he brings a suit to state his cause of action or claim in several different ways, so as to attempt to cover the various possible situations that he believes the evidence might establish. In this consolidated action, each complaint in each of the three cases was originally drawn with four counts, called Count One, Count Two, Count Three, and Count Four. The Plaintiffs have all withdrawn their Count Three, so that you should disregard that count in each action.

Count One, in each action, is a count drawn on the theory or claim that, by various acts claimed by plaintiffs to have been committed by the defendant, the defendant impliedly warranted that soy bean oil meal when manufactured or extracted by the use of trichloroethylene was fit and wholesome feed for cattle, and that the defendant breached or violated that warwanty and thereby proximately caused damage to plaintiffs.

Count Two, in each action, is a count drawn on the theory or claim that by various acts claimed by plaintiffs to have been committed by the defendant, the defendant impliedly warranted that soy bean oil meal, when manufactured or extracted by the use of trichloroethylene (sometimes called "tri" in these instructions), was of merchantable quality for cattle feed—that is, that it was of a quality fit to be sold for use as cattle feed, and that the defendant breached or violated that warranty and thereby proximately caused damage to plaintiffs.

Count Four, in each action, is a count drawn on the theory or claim that by various acts claimed by plaintiffs to have been committed by defendant, including alleged violations of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of the Territory of Hawaii known as the Hawaii Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, or of the said Hawaii Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act alone, the defendant was guilty of negligence and thereby proximately caused damage to plaintiffs.

Under the forms of verdict to be handed to you in each of the three actions, you may bring in a verdict on each count either in favor of the plaintiff or plaintiffs or in favor of the defendant, as the facts found by you and the law as given by the Court may warrant. If you find in favor of the plaintiff or plaintiffs on any particular count, you should determine the amount of damages which in your judgment, based upon the evidence and the instructions of this Court, will fairly and justly compensate the plaintiff or plaintiffs for the damage suffered by such plaintiff or plaintiffs and proximately caused by any

wrongful acts of the defendant which you may find to have been committed.

Plaintiffs' No. 20.

The Court instructs the jury that, if your verdict is in favor of the plaintiffs, then the following rules will govern in computing damages, if any, which might be predicated upon any settlements or payments made by Fred L. Waldron, Limited, with or to the seven dairymen on the Island of Hawaii, the Territory of Hawaii in relation to alleged damages suffered on the Island of Oahu, and Hilo Dairy and Sokei Dairy:

(a) You are instructed that the contracts of Waldron with the respective seven daires on the Island of Hawaii and that with said Territory of Hawaii, fix the amount of the damages to Waldron for those particular items, namely, the claims of said seven dairies and of said Territory, the defendant having stipulated, subject to its defenses claimed on the merits, that these amounts are reasonable.

(b) You are instructed that, in considering any damages suffered by Waldron, you should not include in any award to Waldron any amounts advanced by Waldron to Hilo Dairy or Sokei Dairy under the settlement contracts between Waldron and each of those dairies, Nishida Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 15 and Sokei Plainiff's Exhibit No. 15. Under these contracts, the Hilo Dairy and the Sokei Dairy are obligated under certain circumstances to repay such advances to Waldron, depending upon the amounts of their respective recoveries, if they recover against

the defendant. Therefore, such advances should neither be included in any damages awarded to Waldron, nor deducted from any damages awarded to either Hilo Dairy or Sokei Dairy. In this way, double payments of any damages awarded can be avoided. However, if you find that the making of such advances was necessary and reasonable on Waldron's part under all the circumstances, and that the making of such advances caused a shortage of credit or working capital to Waldron and this contributed to Waldron's damages, you may take into consideration any such effects of shortening credit or working capital in computing Waldron's damages, though not adding the payments themselves to any verdict for Waldron.

Do Not Print (as Counsel for the parties dispense with the same by Stipulation.) John A. Feehan, Jr., Clerk.

* * * * * * * *

Do Not Print (as Counsel for the parties dispense with the same by Stipulation.) John A. Feehan, Jr., Clerk.

* * * * * * * *

Do Not Print (as Counsel for the parties dispense with the same by Stipulation.) John A. Feehan, Jr., Clerk.

* * * * * * * *

Do Not Print (as Counsel for the parties dispense with the same by Stipulation.) John A. Feehan, Jr., Clerk.

* * * * * * * *

"[Caption omitted. Filed November 28, 1955. The following Motion was made in each of the three cases appealed from in identical language, except when the word 'Plaintiff' hereinafter appears, the applicable word in the Nishida case is 'Plaintiffs'.]" John A. Feehan, Jr., Clerk.

MOTION OF DEFENDANT FOR A DIRECTED VERDICT.

United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,
v. Civil Action No. 145.
E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Company, a corporation, Defendant.

Defendant, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, moves the Court, at the close of Plaintiff's case, to direct a verdict in favor of Defendant in this cause as to the Complaint herein, and any and all counts thereof and therein, on the grounds:

1.

The evidence is insufficient to warrant a finding of liability against this Defendant on any theory and on any count herein.

2.

The evidence is insufficient to justify a finding against this Defendant of a violation of a duty, either

contractual or tortious, growing out of the circumstances pleaded or proven in this case.

3.

The evidence requires a finding that any damage suffered by this Plaintiff is the sole, direct and proximate result of the negligence or violation of duty of others than this Defendant.

4.

The evidence requires a finding that there was no privity of contract or duty sufficient to permit a violation thereof between the Plaintiff and the Defendant, and therefore, as a matter of law, the Defendant is entitled to a directed verdict.

5.

The evidence requires a finding, as a matter of law, that the negligence of Defendant, du Pont, if any, was superseded by a new and independent efficient intervening force, in that Magnolia Soy Products Company, after the receipt of the warning letter of date July 31, 1951, from du Pont, voluntarily and wilfully manufactured and sold the soybean meal which was placed into the channels of trade which allegedly caused the damage complained of herein.

6.

The evidence requires a finding, as a matter of law, that the negligence, if any, of Defendant, du Pont, did not proximately cause or contribute to the damages allegedly suffered by the Plaintiff herein.

7.

The evidence in the instant case fails, as a matter of law, to establish any negligence or violation of contractual duty on the part of Defendant, du Pont, which contributed to the damages complained of herein.

8.

The evidence requires a finding, as a matter of law, that as between Defendant and this Plaintiff, there was no privity of contract, no consideration present, and no reliance obtained therein, and no breach or violation of duty.

9.

The record is absolutely barren of any testimony to show privity of contract between the Plaintiff and Defendant herein, and accordingly the Defendant is entitled to a verdict as a matter of law.

10.

The evidence is insufficient, as a matter of law, to establish that the product sold by the Defendant in and of itself was either the causative or contributing agent of the Plaintiff's damage claimed herein, because the record is entirely devoid of proof establishing the part played by the manufacturer of the meal in the processing thereof, either as to the degree of heat used, efficiency of the equipment involved, adequacy of the processes employed, or the age and maturity of the raw materials utilized.

11.

The evidence requires a finding, as a matter of law, that the negligence of Defendant Du Pont, if any, was superseded by a new and independent efficient intervening force in that Magnolia Soy Products Company, after the receipt of the warning letter of date July 31, 1951 from Defendant Du Pont, voluntarily and willfully manufactured and sold soy bean meal which was placed into the channels of trade which allegedly caused the damage complained of herein, and which conclusion has, on the same identical facts, been reached by the Supreme Court of Mississippi in the case of E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Company vs. Ladner, ... Miss. ..... 73 So. 2d 249, and which decision, under the direct and indirect results and implications, including subsequent decisions relating thereto of Erie Railroad Company vs. Tompkins, 58 S. Ct. 817, 304 U.S. 64, 82 L. Ed. 1188 (1938) is binding upon this Honorable Court as to the weight and sufficiency of evidence necessary to constitute a new independent efficient intervening force, and the Defendant herein is accordingly entitled, as a matter of law, to a verdict.

12.

The evidence, including the judicial knowledge of the Court, requires a finding that the law of the Territory of Hawaii recognizes the common law doctrines of proximate causation and intervening act, and that the Supreme Court of Mississippi in the case of E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Company vs. Ladner, ... Miss. ....., 73 So. 2d 249 (1954), has decided that the quantum of fact—in the precise

circumstances as here involved—was sufficient herein to constitute a new and independent efficient intervening cause superseding the negligence, if any, of the Defendant Du Pont. Under the Conflict of Laws principles as expressed by Mississippi law and under the direct and indirect results and implications of Erie Railroad Company vs. Tompkins, 58 S. Ct. 817, 304 U.S. 64, 82 L. Ed. 1188 (1938), the decision of the Supreme Court of Mississippi in the case of E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Company vs. Ladner (supra) is binding upon this Honorable Court, and the matter being Stare Decisis, this Defendant Du Pont is entitled to a verdict as a matter of law.

W. C. WELLS, III,
EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas),
Attorneys for the Defendant, E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Company.

Address of Each of the Above:
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi.

Of Counsel:
CARL E. GEUTHER,
7100 Du Pont Building,
Wilmington 98, Delaware.
WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi.

MEMORANDUM OF AMENDMENTS PROPOSED TO COMPLAINT IN NISHIDA V. DU PONT, CIVIL ACTION NO. 142.

1. Count One, page 1, second line of paragraph 1, change "Kappa" to "Kapaa".

2. Count One, page 2, second from last line of paragraph 7, change "200" to "300".

3. Count One, page 4, tenth and thirteenth lines of paragraph 14, change "could" to "should". Add, at end of paragraph 14, the following new allegations:

"Despite the knowledge of the dangerous qualities and character of said soybean meal manufactured or to be manufactured by the said use of its trichloroethylene, as set forth in this Count, possessed by and imputable to the said defendant, the defendant wilfully, recklessly, negligently and without regard for the rights, safety or protection of any prospective purchasers of such meal, sold and delivered such trichloroethylene to the said Magnolia Soy Products Company, well knowing that the said Company would use the said solvent in extracting oil from soybeans and that the soybean meal so manufactured or processed would be sold to purchasers in interstate commerce for use as cattle feed. And defendant well knew or by the exercise of reasonable care should have known, when making such sales and deliveries of trichloroethylene to said Company, that such purchasers of said meal would or might include plaintiffs".

4. Count Two, page 6, fifth line of paragraph 2, add, after the word "meal" the words "would be",

so that the amended portion will read "meal would be sold and shipped", etc.

5. Count Four, page 11, add to paragraph 8, at end thereof, the following new allegations:

"In so doing, the defendant acted wilfully, recklessly, negligently and without regard for the rights, safety or protection of any prospective purchasers of said meal, including plaintiffs".

"(Caption omitted. Filed November 28, 1955. The following Motion was made in each of the three cases appealed from, in identical language, except when the word 'Plaintiff' hereinafter appears, the applicable word in the Nishida case is 'Plaintiffs', and except in the Waldron case, Paragraph 7 is entirely omitted.)"

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

MOTION OF DEFENDANT FOR A DIRECTED VERDICT.

United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,
v. Civil Action No. 145.
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, Defendant.

Defendant, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, moves the Court, at the close of Plaintiff's case, to

direct a verdict in favor of Defendant in this cause as to Counts One, Two and Three of the Complaint, hereinafter referred to as the contract counts, on the grounds:

1.

There is absolutely no evidence to establish any contractual relationship or resulting contractual duty between the Plaintiff and the Defendant herein, and as a matter of law, Defendant is entitled to a directed verdict on Counts One, Two and Three, heretofore and for convenience termed the contract counts.

2.

There is absolutely no evidence to establish the existence of privity of contract between the Plaintiff and Defendant herein, and as a matter of law, Defendant is entitled to a directed verdict on Counts One, Two and Three, heretofore and hereafter termed the contract counts.

3.

There is absolutely no evidence to establish the existence of privity of contract between the Plaintiff and Defendant herein, and the only contract involving the Defendant in this case being that entered into between the Defendant and the meal producer, Magnolia Soy Products Company, and having been entered into under the law of New York by the undisputed evidence herein, and that said jurisdiction of New York requiring the existence of privity as a prerequisite for the enforcement of contractual or war-

ranty rights, the Defendant is entitled to a directed verdict as a matter of law on Counts One, Two and Three, heretofore and hereafter designated the contract counts.

4.

There is absolutely no evidence to establish reliance by the Plaintiff on any implied or express representation of the Defendant nor any evidence to indicate that any such implied or express representation was ever made to the Plaintiff, and in the absence of such reliance, no action for alleged breach of warranty can lie, and Defendant is entitled to a directed verdict on Counts One, Two and Three, hereinbefore and hereafter designated as the contract counts, as a matter of law.

5.

There is absolutely no evidence to establish that any sale was made to the Plaintiff by the Defendant herein, and in the absence of such sale, there can be no action for a breach of either express or implied warranties, and the Defendant is entitled to a directed verdict, as a matter of law, on Counts One, Two and Three, hereinbefore and hereafter designated as the contract counts.

6.

There is absolutely no evidence to establish that the Plaintiff purchased, by repurchase or subpurchase, any article manufactured or sold by the Defendant. On the contrary, the evidence establishes

conclusively that the Defendant sold only a product used and entirely consumed in the processing and manufacturing of meal by an independent company, not a party to this lawsuit, who subsequently sold it. Having neither direct privity of contract nor even the remote relationship of vendor and subpurchaser, the Defendant owed no contractual duty to the Plaintiff and is entitled to a directed verdict, as a matter of law, on Counts One, Two and Three, hereinbefore and hereafter designated the contract counts.

7.

The Defendant is entitled to a verdict, as a matter of law, on Counts One, Two and Three, hereinbefore referred to as the contract counts, since both the allegata and probata fail to establish either the allegations of reliance upon the Defendant in the purchase of soybean meal or the proof of such reliance. Paragraph 9 of this Complaint pleads that the "Plaintiff relied exclusively on the skill and judgment of the said" Waldron, the immediate seller of the feed, and this allegation is supported by the proofs.

W. C. WELLS, III,
EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas),
Attorneys for the Defendant,
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours
& Company.

Address of Each of the Above:
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi.

CARL E. GEUTHER,
7100 Du Pont Building,
Wilmington, 98, Delaware.

WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi,
Of Counsel.

MEMORANDUM OF AMENDMENTS PROPOSED TO COMPLAINT IN WALDRON V. DU PONT, CIVIL ACTION NO. 143.

1. Count One, page 2, paragraph 5, first line at top of said page 2, insert after the word "wholesale" the words "and retail".

2. Count One, page 2, paragraphs 6 and 7, amend said paragraphs to read, respectively as follows:

"6. On or about October 30 and November 30, 1951, the plaintiff, for a fixed consideration in each instance, ordered for purchase from The Brode Corporation, incorporated under the laws of the State of Tennessee with its principal office and place of business at 20-6 N. Front Street, 1012 Falls Building, Memphis, Tennessee, a total of 300 tons of soybean meal sacked in bags of 100 pounds each and the purchase orders were accepted, and in confirmance thereof the said Brode Corporation issued at its said principal office under the respective dates of October 30 and November 30, 1951, a 'Confirmation of Sale' for each of said orders.

"7. As a result of, and pursuant to, said respective orders, soybean meal ordered by The Brode Corporation from, and manufactured by, the Magnolia Soy

Products Company, Greenville, Mississippi, was shipped in interstate commerce, and delivered, to plaintiff at designated ports in the Territory of Hawaii towit, at Honolulu, Hilo, Port Allen and Nawiliwili, or some of them, the arrangements for said shipping being made by said Brode Corporation or said Magnolia Soy Products Company, or both, and said meal being shipped to said ports in said Territory from the mill of said Magnolia Soy Products Company in said Greenville".

3. Count One, page 2, paragraph 8, seventh line, after the word "Hilo" insert a comma followed by the word "Nawiliwili".

4. Count One, page 4, paragraph 11, insert, at end of said paragraph 11, the following new allegations:

"Despite the knowledge of the dangerous qualities and character of the said soybean meal manufactured or to be manufactured by the said use of its trichloroethylene, as set forth in this Count, possessed by and imputable to the said defendant, the defendant wilfully, recklessly, negligently and without regard for the rights, safety or protection of any prospective purchasers of such meal, sold and delivered such trichloroethylene to the said Magnolia Soy Products Company, well knowing that the said Company would use the said solvent in extracting oil from soybeans and that the soybean meal so manufactured or processed would be sold to purchasers in interstate commerce for use as cattle feed. And defendant well knew, or by the exercise of reasonable care should have known, when making such sales and deliveries of trichloroethylene to said company, that said pur-

chasers of said meal would or might include plaintiff and purchasers from plaintiff".

5. Count One, page 4, paragraph 14, third line, change "$364,530.92" to "$120,000.00".

6. Count One, page 5, paragraph 14, third line from top of said page 5, change "$90,000.00" to "$200,000.00".

7. Count One, page 5, paragraph 15, second line, change "$70,000.00" to "$200,000.00".

8. Same paragraph 15, third line, change "$624,530.92" to "$620,000.00".

9. Count Two, page 5, paragraph 2, sixth line, insert after the word "Hilo" a comma followed by the word "Nawiliwili".

10. Count Three, page 6, paragraph 2, first line, change "time" to "times" and "sale" to "sales", second line, change "time" to "times."

11. Same paragraph, page 6, fifth line, after the word "Hilo" insert a comma, followed by the word "Nawiliwili".

12. Same paragraph, page 7, first line at top of page, change "time" to "times", "sale" to "sales" and "delivery" to "deliveries."

13. Count Four, pages 8 to 9, delete paragraphs 4 and 5.

14. Count Four, renumber paragraphs 6 to 14, both inclusive, pages 9 through 12, as paragraphs 4 to 12 respectively.

15. Count Four, page 12, renumber paragraph 15 as paragraph 13 and amend the paragraph to read as follows:

"13. The transactions upon which this cause of action are based are the same transactions alleged in Counts One, Two and Three of this complaint".

16. Count Four, page 12, amend the prayer to read as follows:

"Wherefore, the plaintiff demands judgment against the defendant in the sum of Six Hundred Twenty Thousand and No/100 Dollars, ($620,000.00)".

MEMORANDUM OF AMENDMENTS PROPOSED TO COMPLAINT IN SOKEI V. DU PONT, CIVIL ACTION NO. 145.

1. Count One, page 2, first line of paragraph 7, amend entire line to read as follows:

"7. In December, 1951, and January, 1952".

2. Same paragraph 7, sixth and seventh lines, change "380" to "220".

3. Same paragraph 7, eighth line, insert, after the words "December, 1951" the word "and".

4. Same paragraph 7, eighth and ninth lines, change the comma to a semicolon following the words "January, 1951", and strike out the words "and 160 sacks were ordered in February, 1952".

5. Same paragraph 7, eleventh line, change "380" to "220".

6. Count One, page 3, paragraph 10, first and eighth lines, change "380" to "220".

7. Count One, page 4, amend paragraphs eleven and twelve to read, respectively, as follows:

"11. On or about October 30 and November 30, 1951, the said Waldron, Limited, for a fixed consideration in each instance, ordered for purchase from The Brode Corporation, incorporated under the laws of the State of Tennessee with its principal office and place of business at 20-6 N. Front Street, 1012 Falls Building, Memphis, Tennessee, a total of 300 tons of soybean meal sacked in bags of 100 pounds each and the purchase orders were accepted, and in confirmance thereof the said Brode Corporation issued at its principal office under the respective dates of October 30 and November 30, 1951, a 'Confirmation of Sale' for each of said orders.

"12. As a result of, and pursuant to said respective orders, soybean meal ordered by The Brode Corporation from, and manufactured by, the Magnolia Soy Products Company, Greenville, Mississippi, including said 220 bags of soybean meal, was shipped in interstate commerce, and delivered, to said Waldron, Limited at Port Allen or Nawiliwili, in the Territory

of Hawaii, the arrangements for said shipping being made by said Brode Corporation or said Magnolia Soy Products Company, or both, and said meal being shipped to sand port or ports in said Territory from the mill of said Magnolia Soy Products Company in said Greenville."

8. Count One, page 4, paragraph 13, third and seventh lines, change "380" to "220".

9. Same paragraph 13, fifth line, insert after the words "Port Allen" the words "or at Nawiliwili".

10. Count One, page 5, paragraph 14, seventh and eleventh lines from top of page 5, change "could" to "should".

11. Same paragraph, 14, add, at end thereof, the following new allegations:

"Despite the knowledge of the dangerous qualities and character of the said soybean meal manufactured or to be manufactured by the said use of its trichloroethylene, as set forth in this Count, possessed by and imputable to the said defendant, the defendant wilfully, recklessly, negligently and without regard for the rights, safety or protection of any prospective purchasers of such meal, including plaintiff, sold and delivered such trichloroethylene to the said Magnolia Soy Products Company, well knowing that the said Company would use the said solvent in extracting oil from soybeans and that the soybean meal so manufactured or processed would be sold to purchasers in interstate commerce for use as cattle feed. And defendant well knew, or by the exercise of reasonable

care should have known, when making such sales and deliveries of trichloroethylene to said Company, that such purchasers of said meal would or might include plaintiff".

12. Count Two, page 7, paragraph 2, fifth and ninth lines, change "380" to "220".

13. Same paragraph, 6th line, insert after the words "Port Allen" the words "or Nawiliwili".

14. Count Three, page 8, paragraph 2, second and sixth lines, change "380" to "220".

15. Count Four, page 10, paragraph 4, first and second lines, amend both lines to read as follows:

"4. In or about the months of December 1951, and January, 1952, plaintiff, for a fixed consideration in each instance ordered for purchase from Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Honolulu,".

16. Same paragraph 4, third line, change "380" to "220".

17. Same paragraph 4, fifth and sixth lines, in each of said lines, after the word "consideration" insert the words "in each instance".

18. Count Four, page 10, paragraph 5, third line, change "380" to "220".

19. Same paragraph 5, fourth line, insert after the words "Port Allen" the words "or Nawiliwili".

20. Count Four, page 11, paragraph 6, tenth and thirteenth lines, change "could" to "should".

21. Count Four, page 12, paragraph 8, add, at end of said paragraph, the following new allegations:

"In so doing, the defendant acted wilfully, recklessly, negligently and without regard for the rights, safety or protection of any prospective purchasers of said meal, including plaintiff".

22. Count Four, page 12, paragraph 11, first line, change "380" to "220".

Do Not Print (as Counsel for the parties dispense with the same by Stipulation.)

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

* * * * * * * *

Do Not Print (as Counsel for the parties dispense with the same by Stipulation.)

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

* * * * * * * *

Do Not Print (as Counsel for the parties dispense with the same by Stipulation.)

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

* * * * * * * *

Do Not Print (as Counsel for the parties dispense with the same by Stipulation.)

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

* * * * * * * *

"(Caption omitted. Filed November 29, 1955. The following Motion was made in each of the three cases appealed from, in identical language, except when the word 'Plaintiff' hereinafter appears, the applicable word in the Nishida case is 'Plaintiffs'.)"

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

MOTION OF DEFENDANT FOR A DIRECTED VERDICT.

United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,
v. Civil Action No. 145.
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation,
Defendant.

Defendant, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, moves the Court, at the close of all the evidence in this case, to direct a verdict in favor of Defendant in this cause as to the Complaint herein, and any and all counts thereof and therein, on the grounds:

1.

The evidence is insufficient to warrant a finding of liability against this Defendant on any theory and on any count herein.

2.

The evidence is insufficient to justify a finding against this Defendant of a violation of a duty, either contractual or tortious, growing out of the circumstances pleaded or proven in this case.

3.

The evidence requires a finding that any damage suffered by this Plaintiff is the sole, direct and proximate result of the negligence or violation of duty of others than this Defendant.

4.

The evidence requires a finding that there was no privity of contract or duty sufficient to permit a violation thereof between the Plaintiff and the Defendant, and therefore, as a matter of law, the Defendant is entitled to a directed verdict.

5

The evidence requires a finding, as a matter of law, that the negligence of Defendant, du Pont, if any, was superseded by a new and independent efficient intervening force, in that Magnolia Soy Products Company, after the receipt of the warning letter

of date July 31, 1951, from du Pont, voluntarily and wilfully manufactured and sold the soybean meal which was placed into the channels of trade which allegedly caused the damage complained of herein.

6.

The evidence requires a finding, as a matter of law, that the negligence, if any, of Defendant, du Pont, did not proximately cause or contribute to the damages allegedly suffered by the Plaintiff herein.

7.

The evidence in the instant case fails, as a matter of law, to establish any negligence or violation of contractual duty on the part of Defendant, du Pont, which contributed to the damages complained of herein.

8.

The evidence requires a finding, as a matter of law, that as between Defendant and this Plaintiff, there was no privity of contract, no consideration present, and no reliance obtained therein, and no breach or violation of duty.

9.

The record is absolutely barren of any testimony to show privity of contract between the Plaintiff and Defendant herein, and accordingly the Defendant is entitled to a verdict as a matter of law.

10.

The evidence is insufficient, as a matter of law, to establish that the product sold by the Defendant, in and of itself was either the causative or contributing agent of the Plaintiff's damage claimed herein, because the record is entirely devoid of proof establishing the part played by the manufacturer of the meal in the processing thereof, either as to the degree of heat used, efficiency of the equipment involved, adequacy of the processes employed, or the age and maturity of the raw materials utilized.

11.

The evidence requires a finding, as a matter of law, that the negligence of Defendant Du Pont, if any, was superseded by a new and independent efficient intervening force in that Magnolia Soy Products Company, after the receipt of the warning letter of date July 31, 1951 from Defendant Du Pont, voluntarily and willfully manufactured and sold soy bean meal which was placed into the channels of trade which allegedly caused the damage complained of herein, and which conclusion has, on the same identical facts, been reached by the Supreme Court of Mississippi in the case of E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Company vs. Ladner, ...Miss.... 73 So. 2d 249, and which decision, under the direct and indirect results and implications, including subsequent decisions relating thereto, of Erie Railroad Company vs. Tompkins, 58 S. Ct. 817, 304 U.S. 64, 82 L. Ed 1188 (1938) is binding upon this Honorable Court as to the weight and sufficiency of evidence necessary to constitute a new independent efficient intervening force, and

the Defendant herein is accordingly entitled, as a matter of law, to a verdict.

12.

The evidence, including the judicial knowledge of the Court, requires a finding that the law of the Territory of Hawaii recognizes the common law doctrines of proximate causation and intervening act, and that the Supreme Court of Mississippi in the case of E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Company, vs. Ladner, ...Miss...., 73 So. 2d 249 (1954), has decided that the quantum of fact—in the precise circumstances as here involved—was sufficient herein to constitute a new and independent efficient intervening cause superseding the negligence, if any, of the Defendant Du Pont. Under the Conflict of Laws principles as expressed by Mississippi Law and under the direct and indirect results and implications of Erie Railroad Company vs. Tompkins, 58 S. Ct. 817, 304 U.S. 64, 82 L. Ed. 1188 (1938), the decision of the Supreme Court of Mississippi in the case of E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Company vs. Ladner (supra) is binding upon this Honorable Court, and the matter being Stare Decisis, this Defendant Du Pont is entitled to a verdict as a matter of law.

W. C. WELLS, III,
EARL T. THOMAS,
(Earl T. Thomas),
Attorneys for the Defendant,
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours
& Company.

Address of Each of the Above:
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi.

CARL E. GEUTHER,
7100 Du Pont Building,
Wilmington 98, Delaware.
WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi,
Of Counsel.

"(Caption omitted. Filed November 29, 1955. The following Motion was made in each of the three cases appealed from, in identical language, except when the word 'Plaintiff' hereinafter appears, the applicable word in the Nishida case is 'Plaintiffs', and in the Waldron case, Paragraph 7 is entirely omitted.)"

JOHN A. FEEHAN, JR.,
Clerk.

MOTION OF DEFENDANT FOR A DIRECTED VERDICT.

United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,
v. Civil Action No. 145.
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation,
Defendant.

Defendant, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, moves the Court, at the close of all the evidence in

this case, to direct a verdict in favor of Defendant in this cause as to Counts One, Two and Three of the Complaint, hereinafter referred to as the contract counts, on the grounds:

1.

There is absolutely no evidence to establish any contractual relationship or resulting contractual duty between the Plaintiff and the Defendant herein, and as a matter of law, Defendant is entitled to a directed verdict on Counts One, Two and Three, heretofore and for convenience termed the contract counts.

2.

There is absolutely no evidence to establish the existence of privity of contract between the Plaintiff and Defendant herein, and as a matter of law, Defendant is entitled to a directed verdict on Counts One, Two and Three, heretofore and hereafter termed the contract counts.

3.

There is absolutely no evidence to establish the existence of privity of contract between the Plaintiff and Defendant herein, and the only contract involving the Defendant in this case being that entered into between the Defendant and the meal producer, Magnolia Soy Products Company, and having been entered into under the law of New York by the undisputed evidence herein, and that said jurisdiction of New York requiring the existence of privity as a prerequisite for the enforcement of contractual or

warranty rights, the Defendant is entitled to a directed verdict as a matter of law on Counts One, Two and Three, heretofore and hereafter designated the contract counts.

4.

There is absolutely no evidence to establish reliance by the Plaintiff on any implied or express representation of the Defendant nor any evidence to indicate that any such implied or express representation was ever made to the Plaintiff, and in the absence of such reliance, no action for alleged breach of warranty can lie, and Defendant is entitled to a directed verdict on Counts One, Two and Three, hereinbefore and hereafter designated as the contract counts, as a matter of law.

5.

There is absolutely no evidence to establish that any sale was made to the Plaintiff by the Defendant herein and in the absence of such sale, there can be no action for a breach of either express or implied warranties, and the Defendant is entitled to a directed verdict, as a matter of law, on Counts One, Two and Three, hereinbefore and hereafter designated as the contract counts.

6.

There is absolutely no evidence to establish that the Plaintiff purchased, by repurchase or subpurchase, any article manufactured or sold by the Defendant. On the contrary, the evidence establishes

conclusively that the Defendant sold only a product used and entirely consumed in the processing and manufacturing of meal by an independent company, not a party to this lawsuit, who subsequently sold it. Having neither direct privity of contract nor even the remote relationship of vendor and subpurchaser, the Defendant owed no contractual duty to the Plaintiff and is entitled to a directed verdict, as a matter of law, on Counts One, Two and Three, hereinbefore and hereafter designated the contract counts.

7.

The Defendant is entitled to a verdict, as a matter of law, on Counts One, Two and Three, hereinbefore referred to as the contract counts, since both the allegata and probata fail to establish either the allegations of reliance upon the Defendant in the purchase of soybean meal or the proof of such reliance. Paragraph 9 of this Complaint pleads that the "Plaintiff relied exclusively on the skill and judgment of the said" Waldron, the immediate seller of the feed, and this allegation is supported by the proofs.

W. C. WELLS, III.
EARL T. THOMAS.
(Earl T. Thomas).
Attorneys for the Defendant,
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours
& Company.

Address of Each of the Above:
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi.

CARL E. GEUTHER,
7100 Du Pont Building,
Wilmington 98, Delaware.

WELLS, THOMAS & WELLS,
900 Lamar Life Building,
Jackson, Mississippi,
Of Counsel.

(Title Omitted.)

Proceedings.

The Court:
The matter we are about to take up this morning is the cases of George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, and Ryoju Sokei, and Fred L. Waldron, Limited, against Magnolia Soy Products Company, and E. I. Du Pont De Nemours and Company, a Corporation, and the Brode Corporation.
Are the plaintiffs ready?

Mr. Burgin:
The plaintiffs are ready, if the Court please.

The Court:
Are the defendants ready?

Mr. Thomas:
The defendants are ready, if the Court please.

The Court:
I would like to say this to Counsel before proceeding to qualify the jurors.

When these two juries were originally drawn, there were two men who happened to live out at Carrollton.

Mississippi, and they come and go from their home together. One of them was on Jury No. 1, and one of them was on Jury No. 2. I have agreed to transfer certain members of the jury so that they both might be on the same jury and continue to travel together. I don't know whether either one of them is for you or against you. Both are regular jurors, and I just want you to understand that part of it.

Put me a jury in the box, Mr. Marshal.

The Marshal:

Jury No. 2 come around.

The Court:

Gentlemen, and I would like all of you other jurors who may be back in the Courtroom, to give close attention to what I am saying to these gentlemen, so that I won't have to repeat everything to you, should some of these be excused.

Gentlemen, this is the case in which some gentlemen from the Hawaiian Islands, who are the plaintiffs in this lawsuit, are suing the Magnolia Soy Products Company, a company that was engaged in the manufacture of soybean meal here in Greenville, and the E. I. Du Pont De Nemours, a Delaware Corporation, which during the trial, I am sure will be referred to as Du Pont, and the Brode Corporation of Memphis, Tennessee. Those were originally the individuals and parties involved.

Now the plaintiffs, whom I have stated, are from Hawaii, are the Messrs. Nishida, George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, who were operating as the Hilo Dairy of Kauai, in the Hawaiian Islands, and another gentlemen by the name of Ryoju Sokei, who was doing business as the Sokei Dairy, also in the

Hawaiian Islands, and Fred L. Waldron, Limited, that being a firm in Honolulu, engaged in the handling of dairy products, feed, and such items.

Now the attorneys in the case representing the plaintiffs are Mr. Shiro Kashiwa, of Honolulu, and Mr. C. Nils Tavares of Honolulu, and Mr. William G. Burgin of Columbus, Mississippi, and Mr. Brooks of Washington, D. C.

Representing the defendants in this case are Mr. Earl T. Thomas of the law firm of Wells, Thomas and Wells, of Jackson, Mississippi and Mr. Carl E. Geuther of Wilmington, Delaware.

Are any of you gentlemen related to any of the parties involved in this case, or to their attorneys?

(A negative reply was received.)

The Court:

Do any of you gentlemen know anything about the facts of this case, or have you heard it discussed by anyone who claimed to know the facts?

(A negative response was received.)

(After submitting the jury as duly qualified to both the plaintiff and the defendant, a jury was finally accepted by both plaintiffs and defendants.)

The Court:

Mr. Clerk, will you swear the jury to try the issue.

(The jury was duly sworn, the oath being administered by Ray Ligon, Deputy Court Clerk.)

The Court:

All right, gentlemen, if you will now state the issues involved in this case, or read me the pleadings so that I may know what it is all about, we will get on with the lawsuit.

(Following a statement of the issues involved, the Court said):

* * * * * * * *

Mr. Brooks:

If the Court please, we would now like to offer in evidence, the deposition of Mr. L. L. Ford, the former Vice-President of Magnolia Soy Products Company, who has accepted a position in Iran, and we had no notice of it. He very unexpectedly left, and so as to not postpone these trials, counsel for all parties entered into a stipulation that I would like to read to Your Honor.

The Court:

Very well.

Mr. Brooks:

It is hereby stipulated by and between the respective parties in the above entitled cause, that the testimony given by the witness L. L. Ford in the trial of that certain cause entitled Frank Ladner, Plaintiff, vs. E. I. Du Pont De Nemours and Company and the Magnolia Soy Products Company, and heard in the Circuit Court of Pearl River County, Mississippi, Case No. 4026, in the same Court, may be entered into the above entitled causes in this cause in the same fashion as if L. L. Ford was present and testified, subject, however, to the following exceptions,

and then there are some four pages of deletions, and those cover rulings of the Court, arguments of counsel over objections, and that comes under those principal headings.

Now counsel in these cases enter into a stipulation today that the exhibit with the Ford testimony both on cross and direct examination may be entered in this case, subject to one objection, that of irrelevancy.

The Court:

Very well. You may proceed.

Mr. Brooks:

I am reading from the original record, at the beginning of page 151.

Mr. Thomas:

We note an objection to any and all notices to and correspondence by and between any officers of the Magnolia Soy Products Company, a corporation, shown to have been formed sometime in January, 1951, and we object to anything had or done on later exchange with any predecessors, or communications with any predecessors, or promotors thereafter, because that is not the acts of the corporation.

Mr. Brooks:

(Reading.)

MR. L. L. FORD, being produced and first duly sworn testified for the Plaintiff, as follows, to-wit:

Direct Examination.

By Mr. Josh Morse:

Q. Please state your name.

A. L. L. Ford.

Q. Where do you live, Mr. Ford?

A. Greenville, Mississippi.

Q. Are you connected in any way with the Magnolia Soy Products Company?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. What position do you hold with that company?

A. Vice President.

Q. How long have you held that position?

A. Since its organization February 7th, 1951.

Q. Were you connected in any manner with the construction or erection of the soybean plant of Magnolia Soy Products Company?

A. Yes, I was connected with it.

Q. When was it built?

A. It was started I believe in June or July, 1950, and was completed about March, 1951.

Q. Who constructed that plant?

A. It was constructed by the partners or stockholders of Magnolia Soy Products Company. We bought the land, the machinery, and other things that went into it and put it together.

Q. After its erection you incorporated it, did you?

A. During the time we applied for incorporation and during the time we were in the process of building it, it was incorporated.

Q. In the construction of this plant, Mr. Ford, did you have any occasion to have any correspondence,

or negotiations, or contacts with the defendant E. I. du Pont De Nemours & Company?

A. I did.

Mr. Thomas:

If the Court please, we object to any and all notices to, and correspondence by and between any predecessors of the Magnolia Soy Products Company, a corporation, shown to have been formed sometime in January of 1951; hence we object to anything had or done on letter exchange with any predecessors or communications with any predecessors or promoters thereof, because that is not the action of the corporation.

Mr. Brooks:

If Your Honor please, this question has come up time, and time again. May we have it settled now with the jury excused?

The Court:

Yes, sir; come back here in chambers. Gentlemen of the jury, you may go out in the hall until we get through. We will call you when this legal matter is settled.

(Whereupon, the Court and counsel retired to the Judge's chambers, and the following proceedings were had.)

The Court:

All right, gentlemen, you may state your position on this matter.

Mr. Brooks:

If the Court please, Magnolia Soy Products Corporation was incorporated on January 3, 1951. Its incorporators were L. L. Ford, J. M. Warren and Lyman Reed.

L. L. Ford Associates, a partnership consisted of L. L. Ford, Lyman Reed and J. M. Warren. Associated with them was the Davidson-Kennedy Company and one Allen Jackson, and a man by the name of Sale.

Now, the incorporators became the stockholders of the corporation, with the exception of a few qualified shares, maybe one per cent. The corporation did not, I understand, approve all of the acts of the incorporators, but the incorporators, in fact, became the officers, and directors, and stockholders of the corporation.

Now, this question, Your Honor, was argued before you, sir, in March of this year, and it resulted from objections to interrogatories filed by the plaintiffs. The objections were filed by the defendant. In that matter the defendant filed ten objections and Your Honor by your order of March 25 of this year, denied nine of the ten objections.

Now the nine dealt with correspondence, telephone conversations and other conversations had by representatives of the defendant with the persons whom I have just named.

The fifth objection was sustained by the Court because that dealt with publication of certain articles

dealing with soybean meal, but they were not issued until after the last acts within the complaint as to the corporation. In other words, I think the first one is dated sometime in July of 1952, and with that exception the Order of the Court of March 25, overruled the objections which were filed on the ground of irrelevancy, and as I stated, dealt with this same problem.

The Court:

All right, Mr. Thomas, what do you have to say as to that?

Mr. Thomas:

If Your Honor please, we stated our position then, and it is just this:

So far as Greenville is concerned, the only connection here with the transaction as regards the death or damage, or deaths or damages, to these Hawaiian cattle, why, the Magnolia Soy Products Company, if the Court please, is a corporate entity which came into being as Mr. Brooks stated in January of 1951, and we think they are going far afield going back to August 11, 1950, which was the question we objected to, and we also object to all like questions, if the Court please, because that would be opening wide the door to parties that are not parties to this cause and who have no connection with The Brode Corporation, Frank Waldron, Limited or with any of the plaintiffs in this case. Hence that would all be incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial, and that is the reason we object to it, if it please the Court.

The Court:

I do not think the objection is well taken, gentlemen. It would seem to me that when a number of parties get together and form a partnership and start in a business, and I am presuming somewhat about what this would be, but they make inquiries of a great corporation as to "how should we proceed", or "by what methods we should take", and that information is furnished to them for that particular matter, and just because of the fact that they incorporated, I do not think changes the principle at all.

The objection would be overruled.

All right, lets go back in the Courtroom.

(Whereupon, all parties returned to the Courtroom, the jury was recalled, and the trial of the case was resumed.)

The Court:

All right, gentlemen, continue reading your deposition.

Mr. Brooks: (Reading.)

"Q. State the first contact had with them in regard to this operation.

A. The first contact with reference to this particular operation was early after we began the planning of it. I don't remember the exact date.

Q. Do you have some correspondence you can refer to in order to refresh your memory?

A. I have a letter here on August 11, 1950, after we had started the building of this plant. I will give you the letter. This was attached to the letter. All of

this was attached to it and so was this. I think that is all that was attached to that letter.

(Deletion.)

Mr. Burgin:
If the Court please, we offer in evidence as an exhibit to plaintiffs' testimony, which we will ask that it be marked Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 20, a letter from T. J. Milligan, dated August 11, 1950, of the Chlorine Products Division of E. I. Du Pont De Nemours Company, addressed to L. L. Ford, dated August 11, 1950, together with eight enclosures which came with that letter.

The Court:
All right, sir.

Mr. Thomas:
Could we see that, Your Honor?

The Court:
Yes.

Mr. Burgin:
Why, sure, excuse me for not showing it to you.

The Court:
All right, gentlemen, you may proceed.

Mr. Brooks:
May we have that marked as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit to clarify and avoid any misunderstanding?

The Court:
Yes, sir.

Mr. Burgin:

All right, sir, we want that done in all exhibits from now forward.

I would like to explain that some of the information might seem long and detailed, but I think it is very essential.

The Court:

Well, there hasn't been anything short or undetailed so far, and I suppose that is something of the same kind, so go ahead.

(The document above referred to was marked as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No 20 for identification.)

The Court:

Proceed.

Mr. Burgin:

We would like to have All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 20 for identification received in evidence.

The Court:

Very well, sir.

(All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 20, the letter from T. J. Milligan, dated August 11, 1950, addressed to L. L. Ford, was marked All Plaintiffs' Exhibit 20 to the testimony of L. L. Ford, and is received in evidence.)

Mr. Burgin:

I would like to call the Court's attention and the jury's attention to some parts of that appendix, which were marked in red, and the word "not" is marked in red in the succeeding passages.

Mr. Thomas:
Bill, you read six million pounds instead of sixty million. Was that not an inadvertence?

Mr. Burgin:
It certainly was. It should have been sixty million pounds of meal.

Also included with that letter are enclosures giving a blueprint plans and designs of machinery which he has described in there, and different essentials of the equipment, charts and graphs and other technical information dealing with the extraction of soybean oil with Tri and included also was a copy of a Stockman's report which was mentioned in the letter from which I would like to read a paragraph or two.

Stockman in this article was describing the effect or disease he found among some cattle that had been feeding tri-extracted oil. I will now read so much of this as pertains to that.

I might state further that the Stockman's Report was published in 1916, and I would like to call your attention to the conclusion of his experiment which he said, "Tri, itself, however, is not poisonous."

Mr. Brooks:
(Reading.)

Q. Let me go into that a little more. I notice that is addressed to L. L. Ford Associates, Eufaula, Alabama; you stated a while ago I believe you had gotten together certain lands and machinery and incorporated it. Was it your statement that the incor-

porators or the people that got this land and machinery together were the same people as the stockholders in the Magnolia Soy Products Company?

A. Yes, this partnership was the partnership of the 3 incorporators of the corporation and they took all of the stock of the corporation.

Q. The people composing the partnership took all of the stock of the corporation?

A. Yes.

(Deletion.)

Letter of T. J. Milligan. August 11, 1950.

First though I want to go into that a little further; how did you obtain these, Mr. Ford?

A. Whoever signed the letter; I think it was T. J. Milligan. That's right, T. J. Milligan—

(Deletion.)

Did all of those instruments come in one letter?

A. Yes, sir; they are listed in the letter.

Q What do those items pertain to?

A. They pertain to the recovery of solvent in the extraction of soybean oil from soybeans with trichloroethylene.

Q. These items which purport to be suggested plans for certain types of machinery; what are they suggested plans for?

A. The machinery, suggested solvent recovery system, and water recovery system.

Q For what plant?

A For the Magnolia Soy Products Company plant.

Letter of T. J. Milligan, August 11, 1950, together with Appendix and all enclosures:

Technical information:

Chlorohydrocarbon Solvents by E. W. McGovern;

Vapor Pressures of Tri-Vegetable Oil Mixtures;

Viscosities of Soybean Oil-Solvent Mixtures;

Heat Transfer Coefficients for Boiling Trichloroethylene and Perchloethylene;

(Deletion to end of page.)

Densities of Soybean Oil-Solvent Mixtures;

Air-Trichlorethylene Psychrometric Chart;

Packing and Gasket Materials Suitable for Use with Tri and Per;

Water Separator for Chlorinated Solvents

Properties of Mentor 28 Scrubbing Oil

A brief discussion of tri-extracted oil and meal—

Enclosing Stockman Report 1916

Cornell University reports

A method for determining residual tri in soybean oil

Schematic piping arrangement of an oil absorption system for recording tri.

(Deletion.)

See preceding page for letter and exhibits to be read to jury.

Q. Did you have any further correspondence with the defendant Du Pont?

A. Prior to that date or afterwards?

Q. After that date regarding any plans, or suggested plans, or specifications, or operational procedures for the Magnolia Soy Products Company, Greenville, Mississippi?

A. I have a letter dated September 29, one October 26, one November 7th, February 13, April 13th, May 8th and April 6th. This is a copy of that one there. This is a copy of that one there.

Q. I hand you here a letter under the letterhead of Du Pont dated September 29, 1950 addressed to L. L. Ford Associates, Eufaula, Alabama; state how you received that letter?

A. It came by mail

Q. Mr. Ford, did you have any additional correspondence with them, or state whether or not you received any bulletins or pamphlets, mimeographed, or otherwise, carrying technical suggestions regarding the operation or construction of the Magnolia Soy Products Company's tri-extraction plant at Greenville, Mississippi?

A. The file I gave you covers the information I had during that period.

Q. Do you have any before that period?

A. I do have but it isn't related to Magnolia.

Q. What does this letter relate to?

A. It relates to certain phases of solvent extraction and meal quality.

Q. You said it didn't refer to the Magnolia plant; which plant does it refer to?

A. I don't think at that time the Magnolia Soy Products Company plant was even projected. I was in the business of building solvent-extraction plants and that was in answer to some of the questions we asked and conversations had regarding the recovery of tri and extraction of tri and the acceptability of the meal on the market.

Q. What is that?

A. A report sent to me by Du Pont.

Q. When was it sent to you?

A. I believe it was sent with that other group. It might be this letter you have in your hand.

Q. Did you receive this Vollersten report after L. L. Ford Associates begun the construction of Magnolia Soy Products Company plant?

A. I think I got this report before then, and also this. I think you are referring to this in that letter here. I'm not sure that is connected.

Q. I now hand you a letter under the letter head of Du Pont dated September 29th, 1950, and addressed to yourself over the signature of T. J. Milligan is that a letter you received from Du Pont through the mails?

A. Yes.

Q. I hand you another letter under the same letter head dated October 26th, 1950, and I will ask if you received that letter from Du Pont through the mails?

A. I did.

Q. I hand you another letter under the same letter head dated November 7, 1950 and addressed to your-

self; did you receive that from Du Pont through the mails?

A. I did.

Letter T. J. Milligan to L. L. Ford, September 29, 1950. Exhibit G.

Letter T. J. Milligan to L. L. Ford, October 26, 1950, Exhibit H.

(Deletion to end of page)

Letter T. J. Milligan to L. L. Ford, November 7, 1950, Exhibit I.

Mr. Burgin:

If the Court please, we offer at this time, a letter under the letterhead of Du Pont dated September 29, 1950, and addressed to L. L. Ford, over the signature of T. J. Milligan. We offer that as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 21.

Mr. Thomas:

We object to that on the same ground, if the Court please.

The Court:

That objection is overruled.

Mr. Burgin:

May we have this marked for identification, and received?

The Court:

Yes, sir.

(The letter above referred to was marked as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 21 to the testimony of L. L. Ford for identification, and is received in evidence.)

Mr. Burgin:

We now offer in evidence at this time, a letter dated October 26, as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit 22, and a letter dated November 7, as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 23.

Mr. Thomas:

To both of which we object for the reasons heretofore shown.

The Court:

Very well, the same ruling.

Mr. Burgin:

At this time, if the Court please, we offer in evidence as all plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 24, a letter to L. L. Ford Associates, Magnolia Soy Products Company, and it is signed by R. Stuart Armstrong of the Chlorine Products Division of Du Pont, dated February 13, 1951, and also as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 25 and the letter together with the enclosures from R. Stuart Armstrong, to James M. Warren, dated April 6, 1951, of Magnolia Soy Products Company, and the letter of R. Stuart Armstrong to Lyman Reed of Magnolia Soy Products Company dated April 13, 1951, and as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 26, and a letter from the same gentleman to Mr. L. L. Ford dated May 8, 1951, as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 27.

The Court:

Al. right, sir. Let them be marked for identification and received.

(Thereupon, the letters above referred to were marked as All Plaintiffs' Exhibits 22 through 27, to the testimony of L. L. Ford, and are received in evidence.)

Letter, R. Stuart Armstrong to L. L. Ford, February 13, 1951, Exhibit G-1

Letter R. Stuart Armstrong to James M. Warren, April 6, 1951, Exhibit G-2

Letter, R. Stuart Armstrong to Lyman Reed, April 13, 1951, Exhibit G-3

Letter R. Stuart Armstrong to L. L. Ford, May 8, 1951, Exhibit G-4

(Note: du Pont stipulated that all of the last-mentioned letters were sent by du Pont to the addressee subject to defendant's objections.)

(Entire Page Deleted.)

Mr. Burgin:

At this point, Your Honor, we also offer in evidence as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 28, a letter addressed to Lyman Reed, L. L. Ford Associates, signed T. J. Milligan of the Chlorine Division of the Defendant Du Pont, dated October 21, 1949, and enclosing a copy of what is referred to as the Vollerston Report in the testimony about feeding experiments with tri-extract soybean meal. That is also a mimeographed document dated May 27, 1949, and entitled "Tri Soybean Extract." We offer that as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 28

Mr. Thomas:

To all of which we object for the reasons previously stated, principally to any offer prior to the formation of Magnolia Products Corporation.

The Court:

I understand the grounds of your objection, and the objection is overruled.

(Whereupon, the documents above referred to were marked as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 28, to the testimony of L. L. Ford, for identification, and are received in evidence.)

Mr. Burgin:

We would also like for the record to show, if the Court please, that insofar as All Plaintiffs' Exhibits Nos. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 are concerned, counsel for the defendant has stipulated that all of those letters were sent by Du Pont to the addressee named therein, through the United States Mails, and that they might be introduced or offered subject to such objections as might be make to the relevancy of the material or the matters contained therein.

Mr. Thomas:

And to objections which we heretofore have made

Mr. Burgin:

That is right, sir.

May it please the Court, again I apologize for going into these long matters, but we think that they are very vital.

The Court

Go right ahead

Mr. Burgin:
I'll try to make them as quick as I can for the benefit of the Court and the Jury and all of the counsel.

Mimeographed Bulletin, Dated December 27, 1949, Exhibit G-6

(Note: du Pont stipulated this bulletin was sent by Du Pont to L. L. Ford Associates and by them received, subject to defendant's objections.)

Mr. Burgin:
We would like at this time, if Your Honor please, to refer again to this letter of October 21, 1949, in which is enclosed a copy of a report on animal feed deaths, and attached to that, the so-called Vollersten Report, that's written by Dr. V. H. Vollersten. He was an employee of Du Pont, and on page 2, he describes the results of experiments with Tri feed meal, beginning on July 17.

Mr. Thomas:
We object to the comment of counsel.

Mr. Burgin:
I didn't intend to make any comment.

The Court:
Go ahead.

(Whereupon, the letter was read.)

Mr. Burgin:
The second paragraph is just simply a summary, and also included with this exhibit was an article

dated December 27, 1949, which I shall read to the jury.

The Court:

Now, gentlemen, I think it is quitting time. Court is now in recess until 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, the Court adjourned at 5:00 o'clock p.m., on Friday, November 25, 1956, until 9:00 o'clock Saturday morning, November 26, 1956.)

Proceedings.

The Court:

All right, gentlemen, you may proceed.

Mr. Burgin:

May it please the Court, we are continuing this morning with the direct examination of Mr. L. L. Ford.

(Reading.)

(Deletion—1 2 page.)

Q. Mr. Ford, did you ever have an occasion to discuss with any agent of Du Pont the question of the toxicity of tri extracted soybean meal?

A. I did.

Q. Do you recall the approximate date of that conversation?

A. I believe it was along about the 8th of August, 1950, we had an occasion to discuss it.

Q. Do you recall who was present?

A. Present in the discussion was Mr. Milligan of Du Pont Corporation, Mr. Warren, a partner of L. L. Ford Associates, and myself.

Q. What was said with reference to the toxic condition of soybean meal which had the oil extracted from it by the trichloroethylene process?

(Deletion to end of page.)

Mr. Thomas:

On the last question on 160. We object to that last question on the ground that it occurred prior to the formation of the corporation.

The Court:

That objection would be overruled.

(Reading of deposition continued.)

(Deletion.)

Q. Who was the representative you spoke of?

A. T. J. Milligan.

Q. What position did he hold with Du Pont, if you know?

A. At that time he was connected with the chemical department, but I don't know whether it was as sales representative, or sales engineer. I really don't know his official capacity, he never gave it.

Q. But he was with the Chlorine Products Division of Du Pont Corporation?

A. That's right.

Q. What, if anything, was said between yourself and Mr. Milligan on this occasion?

(Deletion to end of page.)

Mr. Thomas:

If the Court please, we object to the last question on this page, for the same reason.

I withdraw that. There is no objection to that question.

(Reading continued.)

(Deletion.)

Q. Getting down to the occasion I asked you about, Mr. Ford what did Mr. Warren say to Mr. Milligan?

A. He let me do the talking. He asked me about it and we said we would call Mr. Milligan. I said I would call Mr. Milligan in and discuss it with him now and we did. I asked Mr. Milligan about these rumors and things I had heard and those Mr. Warren had heard too, and he said it was all just rumors and there was nothing to it. I asked him point blank to write me a letter to that effect.

Q. Did you receive such a letter?

A. I did.

Q. The letter you have already read to the Court and the jury dated August 11, 1950, state whether that is the letter you received in response to your request.?

A. Yes, in part. It had another part attached and you have taken it off, but that is the letter with the appendix stapled to it.

Q. Why was Mr. Milligan in Greenville at that time, if you know?

A. At that time we had barely begun the construction of our plant, and they were interested in it because we were going to use trichloroethylene. The real reason for his visit at that time, if I remember correctly, he was on his vacation and on his way

back to Delaware and stopped by and it wasn't a visit he made directly.

Q. Why did he stop by to see you?

A. Because we were interested in the use of tri as solvent extraction agent and we had previous conversations with reference to it.

Q. Did Du Pont Corporation ever send any representative to Greenville, Mississippi, to inspect or make any suggestions as to the operation or construction of the Magnolia Soy Products Company's plant?

A. They did.

Q. Who did they send?

A. Mr. Milligan was there on several occasions. Mr. R. Stuart Armstrong was there quite a few times, and Mr. F. G. Loweron one occasion; there was a man named Hamilton there on one or two occasions; there was a man named Schwartz there on one or two occasions to observe.

I don't think he offered any information or anything else—

I think he was just an observer.

Q. Did those representatives of Du Pont make any suggestions to you as to the construction or operation of the plant?

A. They did.

Q. Were those suggestions carried out by you?

A. As near as possible directly to the letter.

Q. I notice in the letter dated August 11, 1950, reference is made by Mr. Milligan as follows: "Copies of the enclosed technical bulletins and charts were sent to Allen Jackson at the Davidson-Kennedy Company with the supposition that you would see them shortly after receipt." Who was Allen Jackson and the Davidson-Kennedy Company, Mr. Ford?

A. That Company manufactured machinery and Allen Jackson was an engineer employed by them, and on occasions he did work for me privately.

Q. Why did they send it to him?

A. I kept my office in Atlanta until about a month before that time, and on occasions before that time I had seen Mr. Milligan in Atlanta and he thought I kept my office there permanently which I did not.

Q. Was Davidson-Kennedy Company doing any work on the construction of the Magnolia Soy Products Company's plant at Greenville?

A. At that time they were, yes.

Q. Were those bulletins sent to them, and these suggested plans and specifications to aid them in the design and construction of this machinery?

A. That is what they were for.

Q. Do you know whether or not Davidson-Kennedy Company carried out the suggestions and recommendations—

A. I didn't understand you.

Q. Do you know whether Davidson-Kennedy Company carried out the suggestions and recommended procedures in this letter of August 11, and other letters?

A. I do know they did.

Q. Throughout your operation, the operation of the Magnolia Soy Products Company plant at Greenville, did you use any other extraction method other than trichloroethylene?

A. At Greenville?

Q. Yes.

A. After January, 1952 we did.

Q. What about prior to November 1, 1951?

A. No, sir.

Q. When this Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe car number 20530 was sent?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you purchase trichloroethylene from anybody other than Du Pont Company?

A. No, sir.

(Page 164.)

Mr. Burgin:

We might call the attention of the Court to the fact that that might possibly be deleted on this page, because that was referring to a case about which the witness was testifying at that time that had no connection with these cases. Now that was question 2 from the bottom of the page.

The Court:

All right, sir.

(Reading of testimony continued.)

Q. Did all of the trichloroethylene you purchased for the operation of your Greenville plant come from the defendant, Du Pont Company?

A. Yes.

Q. And in the space of that period did you follow the suggested procedures outlined in those letters made by defendant Du Pont for the operation of that plant?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did Du Pont ever make any suggestions as how to improve the operation of your plant for increased efficiency or increased quality of meal?

A. They did from time to time, by letter.

Q. Did they send any representatives to make oral suggestions?

A. They were there, yes, sir.
Q. They did?
A. Yes.
Q. Were those suggestions carried out by Magnolia Soy Products Company?
A. They were.

(Deletion.)

Mr. Thomas:

Page 165, the last question, "Were those suggestions carried out by Magnolia Soy Products Company", Answer, "They were". We object to that as leading, Your Honor.

The Court:

Well, I don't think that is leading. The objection is overruled.

Mr. Burgin:

At this point, if Your Honor please, we would like to offer in evidence to the testimony of this witness, invoices and drafts in payment thereof, covering shipping of Tri made by the defendant Du Pont Company to the Magnolia Soy Products Company.

We offer in evidence as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 29, Invoice No. 2039 from Du Pont Company to Magnolia Soy Products Company, covering 60 drums of extraction grade Tri at a charge of $4,290.00 together with drafts attached on Magnolia Soy Products in payment thereof, dated February 14, 1951.

We will offer all of these for identification, if the Court please, and then ask that they be received at one time.

The Court:
Very well, that will probably save some time.

Mr. Burgin:
We offer as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 39, invoice dated February 23, 1951, for 33 drums of extraction grade Tri, sold by Du Pont to Magnolia Soy Products Company for the sum of $2358.50, together with draft attached in payment therefor.

(The invoices above referred to were marked as All Plaintiffs' Exhibits Nos. 29 and 30, for identification, to the testimony of the Witness Ford, and are received in evidence.)

Mr. Burgin:
We offer as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 31, invoice dated March 19, 1951 from Du Pont to Magnolia Soy Products for 60 drums extraction grade Tri for the sum of $4290.00, together with draft in payment thereof.

We offer as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 32, invoice dated April 19, 1951, between the same parties, likewise for 60 drums of extraction grade Tri for the sum of $4290.00, together with draft in payment therefor.

We offer as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 33, invoice dated May 23, 1951, between the same parties for 55 drums extraction grade Tri, for the sum of $3932.50, together with draft in payment thereof.

(The documents above referred to were marked as All Plaintiffs' Exhibits 31, 32, and 33, to the testimony of the Witness Ford for identification, and are received in evidence.)

Mr. Burgin:

We offer in evidence at this time, All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 34, invoice between the same parties for 52 drums of extraction grade Tri, dated November 21, 1951, for the sum of $3718.00, together with draft in payment therefor.

(Whereupon, the invoice above referred to was marked as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 34, to the testimony of the Witness Ford, for identification, and was received in evidence.)

(Reading of testimony continued.)

Q. After July 31, 1951, did you purchase from Du Pont Company any solvent to be used for extracting oil from soybeans?

A. Yes, on November 21 I got a shipment. I mean a shipment was made then.

(Deletion to end of page.)

Invoice	Date	Exhibit
2039	2-14-51	G-7
14195	11-21-51	G-8
2447	2-23-51	G-9
3648	3-19-51	G-10
5215	4-19-51	G-11
6866	5-23-51	G-12

(Note: du Pont stipulated that tri-extraction grade was sent by Du Pont to and received by Magnolia as per invoice.)

(Deletion.)

Q. Would you state the procedure which the Magnolia Soy Products Company made regarding the analysis for safety or any other analysis the Magnolia Soy Products Company made of the soybean meal which it shipped?

A. We tested the meal periodically and we tested every carload we shipped.

Q. State whether or not you tested Atchison, Topeka, Santa Fe car number 30530?

A. If we shipped that car we tested it.

Q. Is that a copy of the analysis report on that car?

A. It is.

Q. Now was that analysis report received by the Magnolia Soy Products Company?

A. We draw a sample after the car is loaded. We use an instrument and draw out about one teaspoonfull from each bag and mix it together and then draw a representative sample of that and mail it to the laboratory and they analyze it and return a written report to us showing the oil residue, the moisture and protein content. I believe that's right . . . the moisture, oil or fat, and protein and in the case of soybean meal they analyzed it for urease activity.

Q. What is the significance of that?

A. Urease analysis?

Q. Yes.

A. I don't know enough about, but there is some natural element in the soybean by cooking it over a period of time at a certain temperature it will reactivate to urease.

Q. Was the test for urease and the other tests suggested to Magnolia Products Company by anybody?

A. That is the usual procedure and it wouldn't necessarily have to be suggested.

Q. How do you know it was the usual procedure?

A. Because of experience in the business we call for an analysis of every carload.

Q. Do you know what temperature a negative urease report indicates the soybean meal was processed at?

A. The soybean meal was processed at—

(Deletion.)

Q. I will restate my question. Do you know at what temperature soybean meal was cooked at the Magnolia Soy Products Company plant?

A. Yes.

Q. At what temperature was it cooked?

A. 245 degrees Fahrenheit.

Q. Do you know the Centigrade equivalent?

A. I don't know but it would be about 118, 120 or 121—somewhere about that. About 121 I believe is right.

Q. Do you know for what period of time each batch of soybean meal was cooked at this temperature?

A. It was brought to that temperature and maintained there forty minutes or longer.

Q. Why did you maintain it at that temperature that long?

A. It took it an hour to go through this vessel that cooked the meal. However, it comes to its temperature the first twenty minutes and then it is just a matter of holding it there until it goes out of that vessel. It takes it an hour to go through the vessel.

Report of analysis, Woodson-Tenent Laboratories, dated November 3, 1951, Exhibit G-13, relating to Thigpen shipment.

(Deletion to end of page.)

(Deletion.)

Q. I now hand you a letter dated July 31, 1951 under the letter head of Du Pont Company and purporting to be signed by C. B. Shepherd, Manager Chlorine Products Division of E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Company; did you receive that letter from the Du Pont Company?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that the original of the letter you received?

A. Yes.

Q. I notice that letter appears not to have been folded; state whether or not it has been folded?

A. This letter has not been folded. This letter was handed to me by hand and was not mailed.

Q. You say it was handed to you by hand?

A. Yes.

Q. Who handed the letter to you?

A. R. Stuart Armstrong.

Q. What was the occasion for him bringing the letter to you instead of sending it through the mails, if you know?

A. I don't know.

Q. Do you have that letter with you?

A. Yes.

Q. I wonder if you would recite to the Court and the jury the conversations and meetings you had with Du Pont representative, or representatives, with reference to the construction and operation of the plant from the time of your first contact with them up until the time you received this letter.

A I gave you all of my file yesterday and I would like to have those letters so I could refer to them for dates and so forth.

During 1949 and for several years before that time I was engaged in the business of building solvent extraction machinery and selling it. All the machinery I dealt in—all the solvent extraction equipment . . . was to use a petroleum product known as Hexane which is very volatile. The people I did business with and sold machinery to began to inquire about a non-explosive solvent that was appearing periodically in the trade journals; the process developed at Iowa State College . . . (deletion to end of page.)

(Deletion—1 line.)

A. I wrote Iowa State College for information about this chemical they were using which they called trichloroethylene and they in turn referred me to Du Pont Company, and I wrote to Du Pont asking them to send me information about trichloroethylene. Sometime during that year, or the early part of 1950, I met with Mr. T. J. Milligan of the Du Pont Company and at that time Mr. Milligan told me. . .

(Deletion.)

A. Mr. Milligan told me at that time the Du Pont Company was interested in larger mills; they had concentrated on small mills a farmer could buy and set up on his farm and they were interested in developing a larger mill. I was interested in selling mills but my experience with hexane was the recovery of hexane was 12 or 15 pounds per ton of your material process which was not excessive for that type solvent.

At any rate, in my conversation with Mr. Milligan he assured me that it would be possible to get the solvent disappears down to as much as three-tenths of one per cent and we finally proved that to be true. I set about to try to reconcile my way of thinking with the use of trichloroethylene, and during this time I had two or three contacts with Mr. Milligan. I can give you the dates later. Mr. Milligan told me that if I built a mill that would use trichloroethylene that the Du Pont Company would furnish me any assistance in engineering, developing, and designing possible for them to offer me and they did. They furnished me with that assistance. Mr. Milligan paid me a visit on at least two occasions in Atlanta. I had headquarters there at that time. He was down at Greenville, Mississippi on or about August 8th, 1950.

I had some correspondence, which I have here, from Mr. Milligan following that meeting, and I would like to call your attention to it.

I have a letter here dated August 11, 1950 from the E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Company and signed T. J. Milligan of the Chlorine Products Division and he told me in this letter: "Therefore, in our mutual interest, you can be certain that we will do everything we can to help make your Greenville plant a success."

In the meantime we had projected this Greenville plant.

Reading further: Additional technical information on the—

—At any rate they sent me these bulletins Chlorohydrocarbon Solvents, Vapor Pressures of Tri-Vegetable Oil Miscutes, Viscosities of Soybean Oil-Solvent Mixtures, Heat Transfer Coefficients for Boiling Trichloroethylene and Perchlorethylene, Densites of Soybean Oil-Solve Mixtures, Air-Tri Psychrometric Chart, Packing and Gasket Materials Suitable for Use with Tri and Per, A Method for Determining Residual Tri in Soybean Oil, Water Separator for Chlorinated Solvents, and Properties of Mentor 28 Scrubbing Oil.

That is the drawing right there of Water Separators for Chlorinated Solvents. We finally used that drawing in designing our water separator and used the dimensions given in it.

Later, in 1950, I had a letter from Du Pont from Mr. Milligan and signed by him . . . I don't see it right now . . . that he had been transferred to another operation of the Du Pont Company and Mr. F. G. Low would take over the work he was doing, or somebody in Mr. Low's department. I believe Mr. Low was the department head but I'm not sure about that.

On January 11th, 1950 Mr. Low came to our plant. At that time and before that time we had from time to time consulted Du Pont and had had information from them regarding the sizes of the vessels. They had seen every drawing and diagram of all the sizes of all vessels and they had approved it.

On November 7th, 1950 I had a letter from Du Pont signed T. J. Milligan of the Chlorine Products Division. I have it here and it has not been read.

(Deletion.)

Letter, November 7, 1950, T. J. Milligan to L. L. Ford, Exhibit I, already introduced ante, page 157, read to jury.

Letter, October 26, 1950, T. J. Milligan to L. L. Ford, Exhibit H, introduced ante page 156, read to jury.

Letter, September 29, 1950, T. J. Milligan to Ford*

I would like to read a paragraph from this letter dated September 29, 1950 which I received from Du Pont signed T. J. Milligan:

"Several trichloroethylene extraction plants are constructed so that the boiler and extraction plant are virtually in the same room, although in one or two locations, there is a thin, sheet metal partition between the two. It appears to us that the chief danger of fire and explosion is from dust produced by the meal preparation equipment, and therefore, some protective measures must be taken to insure that the dust produced during the preparation of the flakes is not allowed to collect in the boiler room so it will be exposed to open flame. The dust hazard will probably be the major consideration of the insurance companies when determining the insurance rates for trichloroethylene extraction plants. If at any time an insurance company desires information on the flammability rating of trichlorothylene, we would greatly appreciate your getting in touch with us and we will gladly furnish them the necessary data."

*Exhibit G, already introduced ante page 157.

On January 11th, 1950 Mr. Fred Low came to our plant and with him was Mr. R. Stuart Armstrong. Mr. Armstrong remained for two or three days while Mr. Low spent only a few minutes after introducing Mr. Armstrong and telling us the purpose of his visit which was to assist us and help us . . . then he went on his way. From February 23 to March 4th Mr. Armstrong was in our mill instructing the operators and mechanics erecting the machinery, and then he was back in our plant on March 7th through March 9th, and then he was back on March 17th, 1951, and that was about the time we started the operation of our plant.

There was a Mr. Hamilton connected with Du Pont who came to our plant about March 17th. I believe it was March 16th, he came to the plant and was there March 17th. During that period our plant finished the usual season's crush and closed down in the early spring . . . April or May. We didn't operate over 90 days that season. The next visit we had from any of Du Pont's men was on the 2nd of August, 1951, or about that time, and on that day Mr. Armstrong came to our office and brought a letter and gave the letter to Mr. Reed, who was one of the officers of the Company, and Mr. Reed read it and passed it across the table to me. I read the letter and became very much disturbed. I told Mr. Armstrong, "here you've let us spend $500,000.00 building this mill and now you tell us we can't use it to manufacture feed", and he said, "the reason I brought it personally was because I didn't want you to get excited about it." I told him, "90 percent of our business is cattle feed and we can't sell a car a year other than for cattle feed and now you tell us not to sell

any more for cattle feed", and he said, "I didn't say that," and I said—

(Deletion to end of page.)

Mr. Thomas:

If the Court please, we move to strike the recorded answer on the last line, where the witness says, 'I didn't say that,", and I said—', as an attempt to vary the terms of the letter of Mr. Armstrong, and no predicate has been laid on the part of Mr. Armstrong to retract anything from this letter.

The Court:

Go ahead. Let the question be answered under a reservation which I may change later. I've got to get the picture more clearly.

(Deletion.)

A. All right, go ahead, Mr. Ford.

A. Mr. Armstrong flew in there and Mr. Reed met him at the airport. He delivered this letter and discussed it very briefly and then he got on the plane and left and went back to Wilmington, Delaware. Anyway, I asked him, "does the Du Pont Company know we can't operate our mill and have built one here that cost $500,000.00? If we can't sell it for cattle feed we can't operate it. Did Du Pont tell us to shut it down? Do they have evidence?" and he said, "No, there isn't any evidence conclusive; there's rumors circulated from time to time." All through these letters they dispelled those rumors and said there wasn't anything to them. I will read this letter to you. . .

(Deletion.)

Mr. Thomas:

We object to that on the same grounds that we made to the previous question, and move to strike for the reasons previously stated.

The Court:

Well, the same ruling.

Mr. Burgin:

At this time, we offer in evidence as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 35, a letter from C. B. Shepherd, Manager, Chlorine Products Division, E. I. Du Pont De Nemours and Company, addressed to Mr. Lyman Reed, Sales Manager, Magnolia Soy Products Company, Greenville, Mississippi, dated July 31, 1951.

The Court:

Very well, let it be marked for identification and received in evidence.

(The letter referred to, signed by C. B. Shepherd, addressed to Lyman Reed, was marked as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 35 to testimony of the Witness Ford for identification, and was received in evidence.)

(Reading of testimony continued.)

(Ford read the following from first paragraph of letter, July 31, 1951, from Shepherd to Lyman Reed, Exhibit G-21, later introduced by defendant, pages 243, 244):

A. "In recent months there have been increasing indications that trichloroethylene-extracted soybean meal may be associated with a hemorrhagic disease

in cattle which has been observed in widely scattered areas. Research programs are now being undertaken by the University of Minnesota and Iowa State College to investigate the nature and causes of the disease and to determine if trichloroethylene-extracted meal is, in fact, a contributory factor."

(Deletion.)

A. "The cause of the disease is unknown. The evidence that trichloroethylene-extracted meal is associated in any way with the disease is entirely circumstantial, but the most recent reports have all come from farms using this type of meal in their cattle feed. Thus, despite the satisfactory experience with trichloroethylene-extracted meal in the past, we cannot ignore the possibility that this meal under certain conditions, perhaps in combination with one or more other factors, may be associated with the particular hemorrhagic disease observed in Minnesota and other scattered points.

In view of the present uncertainty, we strongly recommend that sales of trichlrooethylene-extracted meal be confined to outlets other than cattle feed until more definite information is available from the investigation now underway in Minnesota and Iowa. To the best of our knowledge, the hemorrhagic disease in question is peculiar to cattle only, and all the available evidence and experience indicates that trichloroethylene-extracted meal is entirely satisfactory as a component for feeding hogs and poultry."

We took the position they knew what they were talking about. We had the mill closed down at the

moment and later in the year we ordered from the Du Pont Company a shipment of trichloroethylene to extract oil from soybeans to be used for cow feed. I told Mr. Armstrong that we couldn't operate unless we did sell it for cow feed, and he knew it was going to be used for that. I will give you the date. November 21, 1951 the Du Pont Company drew a draft on my Company for $3718.00 for 52 drums, 650 pounds each, 33800 pounds net, trichloroethylene Extraction Grade, 11 cents a pound FOB Plant, Niagara Falls, New York, drums included. They didn't anywhere on this invoice, or accompanying letter in any way say this could not be used as they recommended it all of the time through the years past.

In January, 1952 Mr. Chadwick called me over the telephone and asked what kind of solvent we used and I told him tri—

(Deletion—2 lines.)

Q. As a result of that call what did you do?

A. We shut the mill down within an hour and a half. I heard from this source that—

Q. You did shut the mill down?

A. Yes.

Q. Have you ever reopened it, Mr. Ford?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you sold any more meal?

A. I made 33 tons in the process of cleaning up the mill and I still have some of it. I offered it for chicken and hog feed and couldn't sell it and I still have it.

(Deletion.)

A. Do you want me to tell why my mill is shut down?

(Deletion to end of page.)

Q. At the time of this conversation you told the jury about when this letter of July 31st was delivered to you by Mr. Armstrong, did Mr. Armstrong express any opinion on the part of Du Pont as to the safety of the process when used for cattle feed?

A. The letter was dated July 31st but it is my recollection he brought this letter to our office about August 2nd; it was sometime after it was written.

Q. Did he express any opinion as to the safety of the process when used as cattle feed at that time?

A. He—

Q. —or when used for cattle feed.

A. He expressed the opinion so far as he knew there wasn't any evidence that trichloroethylene-extracted meal had anything to do with cattle losses.

Q. When you told him you couldn't operate your plant, without selling your feed for cattle food, what did he say to you at that time?

Mr. Thomas:

We move to strike the answer for the reasons above given, that is, it is simply an attempt to detract from the letter heretofore mentioned.

The Court:

All right, sir, the same ruling.

Mr. Thomas:

If the Court please, we would also like to note the same objection to the question just above that, which

was, "Did he express any opinion as to the safety of the process when used as cattle feed at that time?"

The Court:

Very well, sir, and of course, I'll make the same ruling.

(Reading of testimony continued.)

A. I asked him point blank if Du Pont would recommend our closing the plant down because we couldn't sell it for cow feed and he said they did not.

(Deletion to end of page.)

(Deletion.)

Q. Well, state whether or not you received any warning from the Du Pont Company concerning the sale of your meal for cattle food after the date this letter was delivered to you by Mr. Armstrong?

A. I did not receive any warning from the Du Pont Company, but I received a warning from the State Plant Board on January 10th, 1952.

Q. Particularly in the month of October and November, 1951, state whether or not you received at that time any warning from the Du Pont Company as to any toxic effect tri-extracted meal might have on cattle?

A. I did not.

Q. Yesterday we were talking about the cooking process in your mill and you said it took one to one and a half hours for this meal to go through what?

A. The DT, the Desolventizer Toaster.

Q. I'll just call it toaster. How is that constructed?

A. It is constructed of vats stacked on each other. These vats are 85 inches in diameter and 30 inches deep and inside they have a stirring arm and they are jacketed inside with steam at the bottom and sides. The meals come in at the top and it is let down in gates to the bottom and it then comes from the bottom to the meal coolers.

Q. How many vats in this toaster?

A. Six.

Q. How long would it take if you were to run one sack of meal through this thing? Suppose one sack entered that top vat, how long would it take for it to come out at the bottom vat?

A. How about an hour and a half.

Q. How long approximately would it be in each of the 6 vats?

A. Between 15 and 20 minutes in each vat.

Q. Would it stay in each vat the same length of time?

A. Yes, the vats stay full all of the time and we draw it off of the bottom. Or we did when we operated.

Q. And would it stay in each vat the same length of time?

A. Yes.

Q. What is the temperature of the top vat?

A. The temperature of the meal as it went in was 118 to 120 degrees Fahrenheit and it reached a temperature of 180 degrees in that top vat before going in the next one.

Q. When it went into the second vat what temperature was reached in that one?

A. Just below the boiling point of water, 210 degrees.

Q. What about the third one?

A. It reached 230 degrees in the third vat.

Q. What about the 4th one?

A. It reached 255 degrees in the 4th vat.

Q. When it went from the 4th vat to the 5th vat what temperature was reached there?

A. We maintained that temperature in the 5th vat, 255 degrees.

Q. What temperature was it when it went from the 5th vat to the 6th vat?

A. It was maintained at 255 degrees.

Q. In the 6th vat?

A. Yes.

Q. And from there it came out where?

A. Out of the vessel. As the vessel filled at the top it had mechanical works so that the bottom would open and a certain amount would come out, maintaining the same level in the machine all of the time.

Q. You said something yesterday about a letter you received dated August 11, 1950 . . . or rather you received it on that date . . . and you read portions of it today; tell the Court a[illegible] the Jury the occasion that preceded this letter th[illegible] was the cause of its being delivered to you, if any?

This is the letter here dated August 11, 1950 and I notice this, referring to the second paragraph on page 2: "Several times you have mentioned that certain parties in the South are conducting a "smear campaign" maligning the quality of tri-extracted soybean meal and oil and casting doubts on the stability of trichloroethylene." Did you have a conversation with Mr. Milligan that he had reference to?

A. Yes.

Q. What was that conversation?

Mr. Thomas:

If the Court please, Counsel has just read the question, "What was that conversation", and we object to that on the same ground that it is an attempt to vary the terms of the letter.

The Court:

Well, the same ruling.

Mr. Thomas:

And if the Court please, we object further on the ground that because it was prior to the formation of the corporation.

The Court:

All right, sir, that objection is overruled, too.

(Reading continued.)

(Deletion.)

Q. Just tell what you told Mr. Milligan.

A. We brought Mr. Milligan into our improvised office at that time and I told him what we had heard and asked what about it. I told him that we were at a point at the time to where we could back up, that we had not gone so far that we couldn't convert. He told us there wasn't anything to the rumors we'd heard and I asked him to give me a letter to that effect.

Q. What were the rumors you heard?

(Deletion.)

Q. What did he tell Mr. Milligan he had heard?

A. I was the man carrying the run of the conversation. He didn't know trichloroethylene from anything else. I don't suppose he could even pronounce it. I was carrying the conversation so he would be satisfied in his mind about it because he was putting a lot of money into this thing as well as myself.

Mr. Burgin:

On page 184, for the information of the Court and the jury, so that they may understand what the answer means, why I would like to say that Mr. Ford at that time was referring to his partner and business associate, Mr. Warren, who subsequently became president of Magnolia Soy Products Company.

The Court:

Yes, sir, I understand that, and as I understand, the man didn't know anything about chemistry, and couldn't even pronounce trichloroethylene, and I can't pronounce it myself.

(Reading continued.)

Q. What did you tell Mr. Milligan?

A. I told him what had been said about it and Mr. Milligar. told me it was all rumors and there was nothing to it.

Q. Nothing to what?

A. Nothing to any information we had that soybean meal made with trichloroethylene was toxic, that it was strictly rumors and there was nothing to it. He said they had investigated it and offered this product in some of their trade papers and they would not recommend it unless it was all right. I asked him for a letter to that effect and alor.g with those other things he wrote this letter.

Q. Was there an appendix attached to this letter?
A. Yes, there was.
Q. Will you read a portion of that appendix to which you have referred to the jury:

Mr. Burgin:
On page 185, at this point, the witness quotes from an appendix from the letter of August 11, 1950, which we read to the jury yesterday afternoon, and with permission of the Court and counsel, we will skip the reading as being repetition.

The Court:
I remember it, and I think the jury does too, what it said.

(A. "Appendix. Letter to: L. L. Ford, Dated: August 11, 1950.

Meal
The use of trichloroethylene for extraction of oil-bearing seeds was initiated commercially in Germany and England before the first World War. In 1913-1916, some of the cattle being fed tri-extracted meal in Scotland died of a previously underscribed hemorrhagic disease.
A study of the disease is reviewed in the Stockman Report issued in 1916, a copy of which is enclosed. Several passages are marked in red to call them to your attention. Many people who have read Stockman's Report in a cursory manner, or who have heard the story second or third-hand, believe that Stockman actually showed that trichloroethylene itself was not the poisonous substance affecting the cattle. A malady similar to that described by Stock-

man appeared in several herds of cattle in the Duren area of Germany, in the early 1920's. Investigations made at that time did not definitely establish whether all the affected animals had been fed Tri-extracted meal. In some cases, however, there was evidence that Tri-extracted meal had been included in the diet. Several extensive investigations failed to reveal the cause of the disorder.

In the 1930's, when solvent extraction was in its infancy in this country, Du Pont financed experimental feeding tests with Tri-extracted and methylene chloride-extracted meals at Cornell University. Copies of the reports covering this work are enclosed. On the basis of the Cornell tests, it was concluded that good quality soybean meal can be produced by extraction of soybeans with tri and several small commercial soybean extraction plants using tri were installed between 1940-1950. Complying with the Cornell findings, these plants were designed to produce meal which had been heated to 120°C. for 20-30 minutes during or following the meal drying operation. These plants have now produced approximately 60,000,000 pounds of meal which is readily accepted by most feed manufacturers and has been fed with excellent results in several Midwestern states.

It has recently been brought to our attention that an unidentified hemorrhagic cattle disease, having symptoms virtually identical to those described in the Stockman and Cornell reports, has been encountered among cows in both Iowa and Colorado. Feeding practice on the farms where the disease has been encountered was investigated as a possible clue to the cause and, as might be expected, varied widely from farm to farm. Some of the affected animals had been on grass, without supplemental rations, for 45 days

prior to onset of symptons. Others were receiving soybean meal plus hay, with or without supplemental minerals and vitamins added. On farms where soybean meal was employed, some were feeding expeller or hexano-extracted meal, others were feeding trichlorothylene-extracted meal. There is, of course, the possibility that all animals reportedly suffering from this hemorrhagic condition did not actually have the same disease; however, we have been told that the symptoms appear identical.

An important feature of the occurrence of the disease in Iowa and Colorado is the fact in several cases a single meal shipment was divided among a number of farms with the disease occurring on only one. On the farm where the disease occurred, however, several animals were lost. This is one of the chief factors which has led the soybean processors, veterinarians, and university veterinary faculties with whom we have discussed these cases to conclude that the soybean meal was probably not the cause of the disease.

A number of organizations are continuing to study the disease. If anything new is developed, we will let you know. So far as we know, the occurrence of this disease in this country is not widely known.

Four or five years ago several tank cars of inadequately desolventized tri-extracted soybean oil were shipped to a number of vegetable oil processors. The excessive residual tri in the oil "killed" the hydrogenation catalyst during the hardening operation. News of this occurrence quickly spread throughout the extraction and vegetable oil refining industries with the result that the seriousness of the incident was magnified.

In 1948, Dr. Norris of Swift & Company presented a paper entitled "The Effect of Trichloroethylene in the Hydrogenation of Soybean and Cottonseed Oils" before the American Chemists' Society. He found that soybean or cottonseed oils containing less than 0.01% of tri can be hydrogenated without damage to the catalyst. The evidence presented by Dr. Norris, plus the fact that several major vegetable oil processors have since confirmed the results of his tests, has demonstrated that properly processed soybean oil extracted with trichloroethylene is equal in every respect to that extracted with hexane.

Approximately 14,000,000 pounds of tri-extracted soybean oil has been produced in this country to date. We understand the oil is marketed under the same trading rules as hexane-extracted oil and sells at the going market price. In order to insure that quality of tri-extracted oil remains unquestioned, we are strongly recommending that oil desolventizing equipment be designed to produce oil containing less than 0.005% of trichloroethylene. Also, we are urging that all tri-extraction plant operators analyze the oil before shipment so that no oil containing excessive amounts of tri will be placed on the market."

The rest of that refers to corrosion.)

Mr. Burgin:

We will skip to page 189, if the Court please.

(Reading continued.)

Q. You need not read that. At any time during your correspondence and communications with Du Pont did they ever point out to you the experiments run by Stang?

A. No, sir.
Q. Or those run to Erickmann?
A. No, sir.
Q. Or those run by Lothes?
A. No, sir.
Q. Never at any time?
A. No, sir.
Q. Did they tell you at any time that anyone had clinically introduced, or produced, the identical symptoms which have been described here of these cattle dying?
A. They did not.
Q. State whether or not Magnolia Soy Products Company in the operation of the plant at Greenville, Mississippi, which manufactured soybean meal by the use of tri as a solvent. . .
A. I didn't hear all of your question.
Q. I hadn't finished it. State whether or not Magnolia Soy Products Company in the operation of its plant at Greenville, Mississippi, which manufactured soybean meal by the tri-solvent process, whether in the operation of that plant you followed the directions given you by Du Pont for the operation of your plant?
A. Right to the letter.
Q. You may take the witness.

Cross Exam. By Mr. Thomas:
Q. Mr. Ford, I believe you told the Court and the jury that one of your stockholders knew nothing about trichloroethylene, is that right sir?
A. That's right.
Q. I believe you said he couldn't even pronounce the word?
A. No. He later could I'm sure.

Q. You are the Vice President of the Company, are you not?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. And as a matter of fact they looked to you for the engineering aspect of it, didn't they?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. L. L. Ford Associates, to which you referred in your direct testimony here, I believe had under that heading Engineers and Builders of Solvent Extraction Equipment?

A. That is correct.

Q. Lyman Reed wasn't an engineer, was he?

A. No.

Q. And Mr. J. M. Warren wasn't an engineer either, was he?

A. No, sir.

Q. As a matter of fact Mr. Warren is the man who couldn't originally pronounce the word trichloroethylene, isn't he?

A. That's correct.

Q. As I understand your testimony on yesterday, the incorporators of Magnolia Soy Products Company were identically the same persons who were the parties, or partners, under L. L. Ford Associates?

A. Yes.

Q. I believe you also said on yesterday that it was just . . . well, instead of a different business it was a continuation of the same business.

A. It was not a continuation of the same business. It was incorporated as a process plant to process soybeans.

Q. But the same parties who composed the partnership doing business as L. L. Ford Associates were the same and only incorporators in Magnolia Soy Products Company, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. And the incorporators and stockholders remained the same throughout the operation until you closed down in January, 1952?

A. Yes.

Q. You had had previous experience before L. L. Ford Associates partnership was formed in connection with building or promoting the sale of solvent-extraction equipment, had you not?

A. Yes.

Q. Weren't you connected with Davidson-Kennedy of Atlanta?

A. I didn't state that.

Q. Well, was that true, or not?

A. No. I never was connected with them only in a way that I bought machinery from them and I let their engineers help me with work, or certain work, I had to do. I was not employed by them and was not a party of that concern.

Q. You are familiar with Mr. Allen Jackson of Davidson-Kennedy, are you?

A. I am.

Q. Weren't you working with him in the sale of solvent-extraction equipment?

A. Yes.

Q. As a matter of fact you were in Atlanta, Georgia, when two visits were made by Mr. Milligan, weren't you?

A. I was there when he was there on two occasions.

Q. This invoice you referred to this morning, being the invoice for the last shipment of tri to Magnolia Soy Products Company, I believe the invoice and sight draft attached to it has been marked and introduced in evidence as Exhibit G-8 to the plaintiff's testimony.

A. I believe so.

Q. That shipment of tri came into Greenville, Mississippi, and you paid the draft November 21, 1951, didn't you?

A. The draft is dated that date, but I don't know what date I paid it.

Q. What does the bill of lading show as the date it was shipped?

A. The way-bill shows it was shipped—this isn't a waybill.

Q. Well, call it the instrument attached to the draft then.

A. 11-21-51.

Q. The invoices introduced in evidence, together with the sight drafts attached thereto, is evidence of the only shipments of tri made by Du Pont to Magnolia Soy Products Company, is that right?

A. I believe that's right. If there is any other I don't remember it.

Q. The last shipment of tri before this shipment evidenced by that sight draft of November 21, 1951, was made in May, 1951—May 23rd, 1951, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. So that the trichloroethylene that Magnolia Soy Products Company used in extracting the soybean meal that was sold to L. J. Thigpen testified about was trichloroethylene which you had in your possession prior to the last shipment?

Mr. Thomas:

L. J. Thigpen was the Thigpen in the Ladner case, out of which this Ford testimony was taken, which went to the Supreme Court of Mississippi. I would like for that to be in the record.

The Court:
Very well, sir.

Mr. Thomas:
And on down further, if Your Honor please, reference is made to a Mr. Morse. Now Mr. Morse was the attorney referred to in the other suit.

The Court:
Very well, sir.

(Reading continued.)

A. Yes.
Q. I believe it has been shown here by the evidence and by instruments that a carload of meal was received by L. J. Thigpen about November 11, 1951, in Atchinson, Topeka, and Santa Fe car #30530.
A. That's correct. I did have the bill of lading. It was shipped from our plant at Greenville, Mississippi.
Q. You told Mr. Morse you followed to the letter what Du Pont, through the men you have told us about, told you, or any instructions, pamphlets, or letters received from Du Pont?
A. That's right.
Q. Magnolia Soy Products Company looked to you because you were the engineer to read all of that and you did read all of it, didn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. And you did that about the time you got it, did you?
A. During the time, yes.
Q. You, of course, had some pride in your plant, having invested your money in it?
A. Yes.

Q. Therefore you subscribed, or Magnolia Soy Products Company, during the year 1951 to that magazine called Feed Stuffs, didn't you?

A. I don't know that we did.

Q. Will you say that Magnolia Soy Products Company did not receive from February, 1951 that trade journal called Feed Stuffs.

A. I would say that I don't know.

Q. Were you interested in any of the trade journals?

A. Mr. Reed handled the feed sales.

Q. He was Secretary of the Company?

A. Yes.

Q. And you the Vice President?

A. Yes.

Q. And Mr. J. M. Warren was President and Treasurer?

A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Frank McDonald was plant superintendent, was he not?

A. Yes.

Q. Who was your bookkeeper?

A. Mr. McKee.

Q. And that applied during all of your operations in 1951?

A. In all of it in 1951.

Q. But you depended on Mr. Reed to keep up with that aspect of the business?

A. He handled the feed sales.

Q. Tell whether or not Magnolia Soy Products Company in 1951 subscribed to and received a trade journal called Soybean Digest?

A. I think we did subscribe to that.

Q. In your business did Magnolia Soy Products Company belong to the National Soybean Processors Association?

A. No.

Q. You knew of the existence of the Association?

A. Yes.

Q. One of the reasons that made you remember you subscribed to Soybean Digest is because they had a nice write-up about your plant at Greenville and a picture of it too, isn't that right?

A. I never did see it but I heard about it.

Q. I hand you a sheet and at the bottom is noted "Soybean Digest"; state whether the picture shown on there is a picture of Magnolia Soy Products Company's plant at Greenville, Mississippi?

A. Yes.

Q. Read it and see whether that correctly states the facts concerning that plant?

A. "This 100 ton plant operated by Magnolia Soy Products at Greenville, Mississippi, is the largest trichloroethylene solvent plant in the United States. The mill was designed and built by L. L. Ford Associates. The extraction is carried on in a Bollman type extractor. The solvent is removed from the meal and the meal is toasted in a one-unit desolventizer and toaster built especially for this mill by Ford. The 300,000 bushel storage was completed in time for last fall's soybean crop. Test runs were started for the mill about March 1. The mill, which is prdoucing "Magnolia Brand" 44 per cent soybean oil meal, is under the acting management of Lyman Reed. Frank McDonald, the plant superintendent, was formerly with Delta Products Company at Wilson, Arkansas."

Q. That correctly sets forth the facts pertaining to your plant, doesn't it?

A. That sets forth the facts except this toaster was not built especially for this particular mill. It was a standard item of equipment.

Q. The same as used by Crown Iron Works of Minnesota?

A. It isn't the same as theirs.

Q. Well, is it the same toaster and plant design used by the Detrex people?

A. No, sir, it isn't the same.

Q. You, of course, at the time L. L. Ford Associates were building this plant, were aware of plants being designed by Crown Iron Works of Minnesota and the Detrex people?

A. I didn't know about Detrex, but I had a drawing of the Crown Iron Works plant.

Q. I believe you and Mr. Reed, your partner under that partnership name L. L. Ford Associates, had an occasion to visit, Plainfield, Iowa where Mr. Roach had tri-extraction plant for soybean meal, did you not?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know what design his plant was, whether Crown Iron Works or Detrex?

A. I think his extraction and drying design was of Crown Iron Works and part of it wasn't. The toasting equipment wasn't Iron Crown Works . . . I mean Crown Iron Works.

Q. Do you know of your knowledge at that time whether Iowa State College gave license to Crown Iron Works to manufacture any particular design of plants?

A. I don't know that for sure but I think so.

Q. As you stated you and Mr. Reed did make such a visit?

A. Yes.

Q. You are familiar with the fact that hexane extraction had been used in the solvent extraction of soybeans?

A. Yes.

Q. And you were familiar with that all along?

A. Yes.

Q. And you were familiar with that all along?

A. Yes.

Q. You said this morning that hexane is highly volatile I believe?

A. Yes.

Q. And being such many explosions occur when it is used and that is why you investigated trichloroethylene, wasn't it?

A. Yes.

Q. And that is one of the reasons you and Mr. Reed went to Iowa, isn't it?

A. We were interested in the operation.

Q. As the engineer of L. L. Ford Associates and interested in that you had in mind to investigate it properly before you went into the project investing money?

A. I was interested in the recovery of the solvent.

Q. That is what Du Pont, through the representatives you named, were giving you technical assistance on primarily, that is the solvent recovery aspect?

A. Yes, and the toasting of the meal. All of it has to do with the stripping of the oil. We had a letter that dealt with that and had information with reference to the toasting of the meal and before the extraction and after the toasting. It didn't deal with any particular part of it, but the whole operation.

Q. And the economy in connection with the use of hexane and trichloroethylene was in your mind too,

wasn't it; you wanted to find the cinoarusib between the cost when you went to Plainfield, didn't you?

A. Yes.

Q. Putting your money into it you, of course, wanted to investigate that angle of it. Didn't you and Mr. Reed make further investigation with reference to tri-extraction?

A. Yes.

Q. Would it be a fair statement to say that you made considerable investigation?

A. That's too broad a statement; we didn't make investigation enough.

Q. You went to these plants and you read all available literature on the subject, didn't you?

A. All that Du Pont sent us.

Q. You went to Mr. Roach's mill, didn't you?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you go to Mr. Thompson's mill?

A. I did not.

Q. Did Mr. Reed?

A. He might have but I don't know.

Q. Mr. Reed was interested in the Missouri Soybean Company at Carthuerville, Missouri, wasn't he?

A. I was told that.

Q. Did you know that at the time he was associated with L. L. Ford Associates?

A. He wasn't associated with it to my knowledge at that time.

Q. Mr. Ford, I hand you what purports to be a letter dated October 11, 1949 under the letterhead of L. L. Ford Associates; state whether that letter is familiar to you and if you know whose letter it is?

A. It is signed by Lyman Reed.

Q. That was your partner at the time doing business under L. L. Ford Associates?

A. I don't remember when it was written.

Q. You do know that he did write that letter, don't you, and that is his signature. You know his signature, don't you?

A. I am certain that must be his signature.

Q. The Defendant Now Offers in Evidence the letter just identified by Mr. Ford as an exhibit to his testimony.

Letter Marked Exhibit G-14, Defendant, Cross Examination of Ford.

Mr. Thomas:

Page 198, the question, "The defendant now offers in evidence the letter just identified by Mr. Ford as an exhibit to his testimony." The letter was marked as Exhibit G-14, Defendant, cross examination of Ford. That is in the State case.

(Reading continued.)

Q. Now read it.

Mr. Thomas:

While this is being read, they said they wanted our witnesses out. The invoked the rule at this time.

The Court:

All right, sir.

Mr. Thomas:

I will read the question, Your Honor, that I would like to connect up with what I am about to say. This is on 198. "You do know that he did write that letter, don't you, and that is his signature. You know his

signature, don't you?" Answer, "I'm certain that must be his signature."

If Your Honor please, we offer in evidence the letter just identified as Defendant's Exhibit G-14, to the cross examination of Mr. Ford, and we would like to have Mr. Geuther read this letter to the jury.

The Court:
Very well.

(Exhibit G-14 read to the jury by Mr. Geuther of the defense counsel.)

(Reading continued.)

A. I'd rather not.
Q. All right, we will have it read by one of our counsel.

(See Clerk's Record page 438 for copy of exhibit.)

Letter, Exhibit G-14 read to jury by Mr. Callender of defense counsel.

Q. I believe that is the same Mr. Lyman Reed who was your partner at the time?
A. That's right.
Q. Didn't he often times in introducing you to his friends, or others, refer to you as "my favorite genius"?
A. I never heard that.
Q. You never heard that?
A. No.
Q. Would it be a fair question to ask whether or not he looked upon you with confidence as to the engineering aspect of L. L. Ford Associates?

A. I was L. L. Ford Associates. He was sort of like the runner you sent out with this letter.

Q. You were L. L. Ford Associates?

A. That is correct.

Q. The soybean crop you ran at the beginning of your operations and continuously until this meal was shipped to Mr. L. J. Thigpen came from the fall 1950 crop, did it not?

A. No.

Q. What did it come from?

A. The meal shipped to Thigpen came from the 1951 fall crop. I can check my records and see. Yes, it was from the 1951 fall crop.

Q. You didn't have any meal on hand in August when Mr. Armstrong delivered this letter of July 31, 1951?

A. There might have been some.

Q. From the time you first started operations and continuously until you deliberately shut down in the summer you used the 1950 fall soybean crop I believe?

A. Yes.

Q. You purchased that crop in what month of 1950 if you remember?

A. It was accumulated from October 1st until the middle of November, 1950.

Q. You stored them in your 300,000 bushel storage bins, did you?

A. Yes.

Q. You started up about what month in 1951?

A. We started operations in 1951 in October.

Q. I mean when did you start the operation of your plant?

A. About March 15th, 1951 on the 195 crop.

Q. Right after you started up you had an explosion caused by charred meal, did you not?

A. I don't know what caused it, but it was caused from trichloroethylene.

Q. I thought you just said you didn't know what caused it.

A. I don't know what caused it. You said charred meal caused it but you don't know.

Q. Did you have any charred meal on hand?

A. There wasn't any except in this vessel when we opened it after it had exploded and it was burned inside.

Q. Didn't you say at that time charred meal is what set off the explosion?

A. No, I did not.

Q. But you did find charred meal?

A. Yes.

Q. How many days after that was it the Greenville Fire Department had to be called out there?

A. That was several months later, I think.

Q. Was it one or two months later?

A. I couldn't say but it was afterwards. We were not running the beans through the solvent-plant; they had deteriorated in the bins. We were putting them in bags and into the cars and they caught on fire from spontaneous combustion.

Q. Wasn't that caused by an accumulation of bags of soybean meal you had stacked up?

A. It was ground soybeans.

Q. In your processing operation, you have to crack the beans first, do you not?

A. Yes.

Q. And then flake them?

A. Yes.

Q. Had those been cracked and flaked?

A. Cracked and ground but they hadn't had the tri process put to them.

Q. At any rate, the Greenville Fire Department came out and put out the fire, did they not?

A. Yes; it actually was not a fire. Nobody was at the plant and somebody saw smoke coming from the building and . . .

Q. Don't you stay at the plant all of the time while it is operating, or rather, didn't you stay at the plant all of the while it was operating?

A. No, I'd go to lunch.

Q. Did you ever go out of town?

A. Occasionally, yes.

Q. And would that be true during the operations of 1951?

A. The first part of 1951 I was out a good deal.

Q. After this first explosion you had an explosion on March 18th, 1951, caused by an acetylene torch burning the extractor?

A. Yes.

Q. You heard read in evidence the warning made against the use of fire around there, didn't you?

A. That referred to dust in the preparation operation; that's the only hazard that can be considered.

Q. You mean as the engineer of this project and the man they all looked to you didn't know an open flame would set off an explosion from trichloroethylene vapors?

Is that what you tell this jury sir?

A. I didn't know it at that time but I know it now.

Q. You did know it when that explosion occurred?

A. Yes.

(Deletion.)

Q. Mr. Ford, I will ask you whether or not Mr. R. Stuart Armstrong of Du Pont had an occasion to deliver this booklet entitled Chemical Safety Data Sheet S-D-14 on Trichloroethylene"?

Mr. Thomas:

We would like to introduce in evidence a brochure or phamphlet entitled "Chemical Safety Data Sheet S-D-14 on Trichloroethylene". There is not an intervening question, but the next is the answer on account of the stipulated deletions by the parties. Could Mr. Geuther read the answer?

The Court:

All right, sir.

Mr. Thomas:

At this time, we would like to offer in evidence Defendants' Exhibits D-4, D-5, and D-6, D-6 being a card evidently from Du Pont, but it is not clear, but it is dated December, 1951, I believe, is that right? No, this is from Du Pont, but it is not dated except December 18, 1946; is that right?

Mr. Burgin:

We've no objections to that being received in evidence.

Mr. Thomas:

Let them be marked for identification, if the Court please.

(The documents above referred to were marked as Defendants' Exhibits D-4, D-5, and D-6 for indentification, to the cross examination of Mr. Ford.)

The Court:

Very well, sir, let them be marked.

Mr. Thomas:
We now ask that those documents be received in evidence.

Mr. Burgin:
No objections.

The Court:
Let them be received.

(The documents heretofore marked as Defendants' Exhibits D-4, D-5, and D-6 for identification to the testimony of Witness Ford, are received in evidence.)

Mr. Thomas:
If the Court please, we would like to have one short excerpt from Defendants' Exhibit D-5 read to the jury.

The Court:
All right, sir. Mr. Geuther can go ahead and read it.

(Excerpt read.)

(Reading of Mr. Ford's testimony continued.)

(Deletion.)

A. I might have gotten it, but I don't remember whether he gave me that or not.

(Deletion.)

(Deletion.)

(Exhibit G-15, Chemical Safety Data, see SD-14, Trichloroethylene, offered by defendant.)

A. We could have but I don't recognize it.

(Deletion.).

Q. I hand you what purports to be a card and I will ask you whether you recall having received that from Mr. Armstrong, or anyone, with Du Pont Company in 1951?

A. I could have but I don't recognize it.

(Deletion.)

Card, Exhibit G-16, offered by defendant on cross examination.

Q. And as you have said, Mr. Ford, whatever Du Pont sent you, you read as engineer and the main man of Magnolia Soy Products Company, is that right sir?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you read it?

A. Yes.

Q. All right, would you mind reading this, please sir.

A. My eyes aren't doing so good. Let somebody else read it.

Pamphlet, Du Pont Chlorinated Hydrocarbons, Exhibit G-17, same as Plaintiff's Exhibit XXX-1, offered in evidence by Du Pont on cross-examination. One paragraph—second paragraph, column 2, page 8 of Exhibit G-17 read to the jury.

(Deletion.)

Q. I hand you a pamphlet attached as Exhibit A to Answer #17 of E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Company, which answers were filed and introduced in evidence yesterday, state whether you received that pamphlet from Du Pont in 1951 about the time you began operations?

A. I could have.

(Deletion to end of page.)

(See preceding page.)

(Deletion.)

Q. Mr. Ford, as engineer and main man for Magnolia Soy Products Company Mr. Frank McDonald, your plant superintendent, told you repeatedly to get out this space heater you had in your plant, didn't he?

A. I deny that.

Q. Did he tell you anything like that?

A. He never told me that at any time. He was plant superintendent and he had a right to move it if he wanted to.

Q. Were you his superior or inferior?

A. I was a stockholder of the Company; at the time he was there I did not manage the affairs.

Q. You left it up to Mr. McDonald, did you?

A. I was about the plant to be sure but not all of the time.

Q. Were you Vice President of the Company?

A. Yes.

Q. You didn't have the right to fire him or get after him?

A. I did and I did do it, but so far as this space heater is concerned you referred to he could have moved it or left it at his discretion, and if I remember correctly he did move it at times.

Q. Do you deny he told you repeatedly in March, April, and May that space heater had to come out or an explosion was going to happen?

A. I deny it.

Q. Being about the premises quite often you say that space heater on and lighted, did you not?

A. Not during May and April.

Q. Well, when did you see it lighted?

A. During the cold weather when the plant was being erected and operated.

Q. Do you deny it was lighted in the months of March, April, and May? That is, 1951?

A. I don't deny it. I don't know that it was and don't deny it wasn't.

Q. You were not about the premises all of the time, were you?

A. No.

Q. Mr. McDonald was your plant superintendent?

A. Yes.

Q. Didn't Mr. R. Stuart Armstrong tell you that space heater had to be removed, that the fire in it could cause an explosion?

A. I deny it.

Q. He didn't tell you that at any time at the plant or anywhere else?

A. He didn't tell me it could cause an explosion.

Q. Did he point it out and tell you it lighted and had to come out?

A. No.

Q. You had this second explosion caused by an acetylene torch burning of an extractor on March 18, 1951, didn't you?

A. Yes.

Q. I believe one of your employees was working with welding equipment on an extractor burning a hole, was he not?

A. Yes.

Q. How many thousands of bushels of soybeans burned by spontaneous combustion or any other method at any time during your operations, Mr. Ford?

A. You mean in the mill?

Q. Yes, or in your bins, altogether?

A. I couldn't say.

Q. Up in the hundreds of thousands, wasn't it?

A. More or less.

Q. You used those beans, didn't you?

A. Not to make meal. We sold the burned beans for fertilizer. We didn't extract oil from them. We ground them into fertilizer.

Q. You carried them through the grinding process, did you?

A. Yes.

Q. And the flaking process?

A. Yes, and into the grinder and into bags.

Q. None of the burned beans went into the soybean meal you sold?

A. I didn't say there wasn't any, but ones completely destroyed as a whole they were not used; and partially destroyed ones were used in the meal products. You couldn't separate them right down to the last bean, you know.

Q. All the while when you first began operations in March and continuously until you closed you had a contract with St. Louis Terminal Warehouse to bond your inventory of soybeans, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Ford, what became of $150,000 worth of beans that disappeared from the bins and storages in May?

A. I don't know.

Q. They did disappear, didn't they?

A. I don't know.

Q. You didn't know about that, sir?

A. Mr. Warren put most of the money into this thing and he was a merchant and had charge of the buying and selling of beans at that time.

Q. You will admit that at least $100,000 worth of beans disappeared, won't you?

Mr. Brooks:
(Page 208.)

If the Court please, would you instruct the jury to disregard that question.

The Court:
Yes, sir, I can't see how that could possibly have anything to do with this.

(Reading of Mr. Ford's testimony continued.)

(Deletion.)

Q. You shut down about June 6, 1951, did you not?
A. Sometime in the early spring.

(Deletion to end of page.)

Q. I withdraw that question. Did you shut down in June?

A. Yes.

Q. One of the reasons for which was that you had considerable beans badly burned, wasn't it?

A. Yes.

Q. And also because a considerable amount of beans disappeared from storage there, is that right?

A. I can't say about that.

Q. You shut down also because you were practically out of funds and credit; you told Mr. Armstrong that, didn't you?

A. I don't remember telling him that.

Q. Did you tell Mr. McDonald or Mr. Armstrong at any time that is one of the reasons you had to shut down?

A. I did not and would not pass out that information, no, sir.

Q. On September 22nd, 1951, I believe Mr. McDonald left to go to the Air Force, didn't he?

A. About that time, or I heard that.

Q. On November 2nd, 1951, you had a terrific explosion in your plant, didn't you Mr. Ford?

A. About that time.

Q. And unfortunately a man was killed in that explosion, was he not?

A. Yes.

Q. One of your employees?

A. Yes.

Q. As an engineer did you inspect and find out that too was caused by acetylene torch?

A. Never could determine that. It was so utterly destroyed we couldn't determine what was the cause of it.

Q. After Mr. Armstrong delivered this letter, about August 2nd, 1951 . . . you remember the occasion?

A. Oh, yes, I remember the occasion.

Q. You were shut down at that time I believe?

A. Yes.

Q. And when did you start up operations again?

A. We started operations on the 23rd of September.

Q. 1951?

A. That is correct.

Q. After August 2nd, 1951, or whatever date Mr. Armstrong was there to deliver that letter of July 31, 1951, were you selling those burned soybeans as fertilizer then?

A. Some of them.

Q. At the time Mr. Armstrong delivered this letter of July 31, 1951, were you then and thereafter at any time selling burned beans as fertilizer?

A. We were.

Q. You were not manufacturing any beans until you began operations in September?

A. That's right.

Q. Were you selling any meal you had on hand at that time, on August 2nd and thereafter until you began operations?

A. If we had any we sold it for fertilizer. I don't know how much we had.

Q. Mr. Ford I want to ask you if this is not true: didn't your plant superintendent, Mr. Frank McDonald, tell you many times he could not get the temperature up in that plant to 240 degrees Fahrenheit or to 120 degrees Centigrade?

A. He did not. That was not true. It was possible and it was maintained at that temperature.

Q. You told Mr. Morse, I believe, about raising it to 255 degrees Fahrenheit in the last two vats, I believe?

A. In vats 4 and 5.

Q. You were not there all of the time to know whether that was done or not, were you?

A. I was in and out periodically and they had instructions to hold it there at that temperature and anytime it fell below that to stop the inflow and outflow unil the temperature reached that point. I think my analysis will show it was properly cooked.

Q. Didn't Mr. Frank McDonald tell you, "We have a defective cooker basket and it goes away below" and you told him to go ahead anyway?

A. I don't remember a conversation of that kind.

Q. Well, did he make any statement to that effect? That the equipment was defective and it would go away below and you told him to go ahead?

A. I deny that statement.

Q. You deny you told him to go ahead, sir?

A. I deny it.

Q. You deny, do you, that you told Frank McDonald, your plant superintendent, when he told you the equipment was defective and the temperature would go away below to go ahead?

A. I gave him instructions as to how much temperature I wanted it cooked at and any time it fell below that to stop the inflow and outflow until the temperature went back up.

Q. Do you tell us that's the only instructions and statement you made in the plant, or elsewhere, to Mr. Frank McDonald, sir?

A. About the temperature of the meal that was the instructions.

Q. And that is the only instructions given Mr. McDonald about the temperature, is that right?

A. Yes, of the meal.

Q. I want to ask you, Mr. Ford, if this isn't a fair question: didn't Mr. Frank McDonald, your plant

superintendent, tell you sometime in April, or sometime before the summer when you closed down, that if you required him to keep up this high production he couldn't get the temperature at that time?

A. That was discussed. We never did attain high production at that time.

Q. Were you pushing him for high production, sir?

A. Not particularly, but good production.

Q. Didn't he tell you that if you pushed him for high production he could not possibly reach that temperature?

A. The moisture of the beans were so high—

Q. They were green?

A. No, they were not green. The vessel was rated at 8000 pounds per hour and would take beans at 11 per cent moisture. The way it was designed it would cook to that temperature 8000 pounds per hour and if the moisture in the beans was 18 per cent it wouldn't do that. We never operated during that time you are speaking of over 5000 pounds per hour.

Q. I want to ask you if this is not true: didn't Mr. Frank McDonald tell you, "You are pushing me to get this high production and I can't get safe temperatures" and you told him to go ahead?

A. No, sir.

(Deletion.)

Q. Do you deny that?

A. I deny it.

Q. Didn't he tell you, "Mr. Ford, I can't get this safe temperature we have to have because you are pushing me with defective cooker baskets and you can't sell it for cattle feed", and you said, "We are going to sell it only for hog and chicken feed"?

A. I deny that.

Q. You deny ever telling him that at any time?

A. I did not tell him that.

Q. Frank McDonald never did protest to you about your safe temperature?

A. He had instructions to do what I told him and so far as I know he did.

Q. You were out of beans and you were closed down and then you started up operations September 23, 1951; isn't that right, sir?

A. Yes.

Q. Didn't you purchase and have to use some green beans?

A. We bought beans right from the wagons.

Q. Wasn't that right shortly before the crop was really mature?

A. It might have been.

Mr. Thomas:

At this time the defendant Du Pont would like to introduce Exhibits D-7 and D-8, if Your Honor please. We would like to introduce them in evidence.

The Court:

Very well. Let them be marked and received in evidence.

(The documents above referred to were marked Defendants' Exhibits D-7 and D-8 for identification, to the cross examination of Mr. Ford, and are received in evidence.)

Mr. Thomas:

If Your Honor please, may Mr. Geuther read the letter?

The Court:
Yes, sir.

(The letter was read by Mr. Geuther.)

The Court:
Gentlemen, it is now 10:30. We will take a recess until 10:45.

(Brief recess.)

(Following the recess, the hearing of the case was resumed.)

(Reading of Mr. Ford's testimony continued.)

Q. Mr. Ford, didn't you write a letter February 14, 1952 to Du Pont?

(Deletion.)

Q. State whether or not you remember writing to Du Pont Company and telling them about the majority stockholders threatening action against L. L. Ford Associates about this mill?

A. Let me see whether or not that is my signature. I don't remember writing it.

Q. All right, sir, take a look at it.

A. I wrote this letter and signed it.

Letter, February 14, 1952, L. L. Ford to Shepherd, Exhibit G-18, offered by du Pont on cross-examination.

(Deletion.)

Q. At this time you wrote not to Mr. R. Stuart Armstrong but to Mr. C. B. Shepherd, Manager of Chlorine Products Division, is that right?

A. That's right.

Q. Do you remember anything now about telling him, Mr. Shepherd, you received that letter from Mr. Shepherd dated July 13, 1951 which has been introduced in evidence?

A. I recall it.

(Deletion.)

(Exhibit G-18, read to jury on cross-examination.)

Q. In this letter to Mr. C. B. Shepherd, Manager of the Chlorine Products Division, you made this statement: On July 31, 1951 you wrote that some trouble had developed from feeding trichloroethylene extracted meal and advised us to channel our meal to poultry and hog feeders." Why didn't you tell Mr. Shepherd about Mr. Armstrong telling you to go ahead and sell it for cattle feed if it was so, Mr. Ford?

A. I was writing to Mr. Shepherd.

Q. You were writing to the Manager, Chlorine Products Division?

A. That's right.

Q. But you didn't tell him anything about Mr. Armstrong saying "go ahead and sell it for cattle feed", did you? If he said that, why didn't you tell it in that letter, sir?

A. He said it.

Q. If he said it, why didn't you say something about it in that letter?

A. I was writing to Mr. Shepherd and I had no reason for telling him. I wanted Mr. Shepherd to share this responsibility with me.—(deletion.

(Deletion.)

Q. You told Mr. Morse on direct examination and repeated to me on cross examination, did you not, that Magnolia Soy Products Company was merely a corporation having the same incorporators and stockholders as the partnership of L. L. Ford Associates, is that right, sir?

A. That is correct.

Q. As a matter of fact weren't the incorporators and personally known to you, two secretaries in the office of Messrs. Wynn, Hafter, Lake & Tindall?

A. Actually they were the incorporators because under the law it has to be done or handled that way.

Q. So you were mistaken about it when you said the incorporators of the corporation were the same as the partnership of L. L. Ford Associates, weren't you?

A. I was mistaken. I meant it was incorporated and we purchased the stock and put in the capital.

Q. Do you say that the stockholders of Magnolia Soy Products Company were the same persons as the partnership . . . were the same persons as those in the partnership of L. L. Ford Associates?

A. That is correct.

Q. As a matter of fact, when you had this organizational meeting February 3, 1951 at Greenville, wasn't there five directors elected at that time, namely: J. M. Warren, L. L. Ford, Lyman Reed, W. T. Wynn and A. F. Toler?

A. Actually there was

Q. Did they hold stock?

A. Mr. Toler one share and Mr. Wynn one share.

Q. How many shares were issued by the corporation?

A. 25,000 shares.

Q. And with the exception of the one to Mr. Wynn and one to Mr. Toler, Mr. J. M. Warren, L. L. Ford and Lyman Reed owned all the remainder of the stock, is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Ford, why did you tell Mr. C. B. Shepherd in this letter marked Exhibit G-18, Defendant, cross examination Ford, as follows: "the majority stockholders are threatening action against L. L. Ford Associates to recover the cost of the extraction plant which amounts of $265,000. The L. L. Ford Associates are in no position to take this responsibility alone."

A. I made that statement because a majority of the stockholders, who was Mr. Warren, had made such a statement to me.

Q. You have testified he was a partner and member of L. L. Ford Associates, I believe.

A. Yes.

Q. You mean Mr. Warren as majority stockholder was going to sue himself?

A. That was the information he gave to me. He said, "I'm going to sue you and Lyman and everybody . . . I'm going to try to recover my money."

Q. Didn't Mr. Warren disappear when that $150,000.00 worth disappeared from St. Louis Terminal Warehouse in May, 1951?

A. He did not disappear.

(Deletion.)

Q. You say the "majority stockholders" referred to in this letter is Mr. Warren?

A. He held the majority of the stock.

Q. Why did you say in the letter "the majority stockholders" if he was the only one? Can you explain that, sir?

A. I don't know. It might be a typographical error.

Q. You mean it is one majority stockholder. If Mr. Warren, the majority stockholder, was a partner in L. L. Ford Associates, why did you represent to Mr. Shepherd in this letter: "This soybean mill was built by the writer and Lyman Reed doing business as L. L. Ford Associates and sold to the Magnolia Soy Products Company." Why did you make that statement when you knew Mr. Warren was a partner in L. L. Ford Associates?

A. I can't account for that.

(Deletion.)

Q. In October, 1951, weren't you advised that the American Feed National Official Association had passed a resolution that all soybean processors should cease selling soybean meal extracted with trichloroethylene as cattle feed until they found out what was causing the deaths?

A. I was not a member of that association and was not so advised.

Q. And I believe you have told the jury you did not subscribe to the trade journal Feed Stuffs?

A. I have no recollection of subscribing to it.

Q. That's all. Thank you, Mr. Ford.

Mr. Burgin:

If he Court please, there is only a small amount of direct testimony, Your Honor.

The Court:

Well, skip the first questions on page 219, and go ahead.

(The testimony of Mr. Ford continued.)

(Deletion.)

Q. Mr. Ford, do you know whether or not any of the burned soybean meal Mr. Thomas so persistently questioned you about was in this Atchison, Topeka, Santa Fe car #30530 . . . I believe that was the number . . . shipped to Mr. L. J. Thigpen?

A. I know there was not any

Q. After these various explosions Mr. Thomas went into so thoroughly, was the plant rebuilt?

A. Yes.

Q. And was it rebuilt in accordance with the original instructions and recommendation Du Pont made to you?

A. Yes.

(Deletion.)

A. It was replaced exactly like it was before.

Q. How was it rebuilt?

A. It was rebuilt as it was originally designed.

Q. Who aided and assisted you in the design of this machinery?

A. Du Pont aided me in the design of it.

Q. Such recommendations and designs you have testified they advised you as to, tell the jury whether or not those were the ones the machinery was rebuilt in accordance with?

A. Yes, the machinery was rebuilt according to its original design; it was not changed or altered a bit.

Q. That's all.

(Deletion.)

Q. What letters did you get from the Du Pont Company about that rebuilding after November 2nd, 1951?

A. I don't recall any.

Q. You didn't get any, did you?

A. I might have, but I don't remember any.

Q. You didn't get any information from Du Pont after November 2, 1951 about rebuilding this machinery, did you?

A. I don't recall it.

Q. That's all.

Re-Direct Exam.

By Mr. Morse:

Q. The plans and specifications you testified to you rebuilt the plant according to, they were the original ones furnished to you by the Du Pont Company, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. That's all.

(The testimony of Mr. Ford was concluded.)

• • • • • • • •

(Title Omitted.)

RAYMOND T. VAUGHN, a witness called by and on behalf of the plaintiffs, was duly sworn, the oath being administered by Ray Ligon, Deputy Clerk.

Direct Examination.

By Mr. Tavares:

Q. Will you give us your full name, please?

A. Raymond T. Vaughn.

Q. And your address?

A. 932 Biggs, Memphis, Tennessee.

Q. What is your present business?

A. I am Professor of Chemistry and head of the Chemical Department at Southwestern College, Memphis, Tennessee, and Director of Research and Consulting Services with the Barrow-Agee Laboratories in Memphis.

Q. What colleges or universities have you graduated from?

A. I have a Bachelor's degree from Culver Stokton College in Missouri, which I obtained in 1933, a Master's degree from the University of Missouri, which I obtained in 1942, and a Ph.D. from the University of Missouri, in 1948.

Q. Will you describe briefly in addition to what you have already stated or included, what positions you have held up to this time?

A. I came to Southwestern College in 1942 as Assistant Professor of Chemistry; I became head of the department in 1945, and I am still in that capacity; and I became associated with the Barrow-Agee Laboratories in 1951.

Q. And Barrow-Agee Laboratories are what?

A. They are consultants and analytical laboratories.

Q. In what field?

A. The field of chemistry.

Q. Have you done any reading relating to the history and effect of feeding of soybean oil meal which has been extracted by the use of trichloroethylene as a solvent, to cattle?

A. I have.

Q. Will you briefly describe the books and articles you have read in that connection, or some of them?

A. Some of them, those which I consider more pertinent; in the July issue of Journal of American Oil Chemists Society. There is an article by Warren Goss of Pillsbury Mills, entitled, "Trends in Oil Seed Industry", and in that article, there are a number of references listed, among those are one by Sir Stuart Stockman; in the Journal of Comparative Pathology and Therapeutics, which was published in 1916, or written in 1916, with reference to an article by Doctor Stang, entitled "Cause of and Cure of Diseases", published in 1927.

And there is an article by Twihouse entitled "The Presence of Hemorrhagic Factor in Soybean Pellets Extracted with Trichloroethylene as Solvent", which appeared in the Veterinary Medicine, in November, 1951; and there are two papers entitled "Aplastic Anemia of Cattle Associated with Injestion of Trichloroethylene Extracted Soybean Meal." These appeared in the Journal of American Veterinary Medical Association in July of 1952, and in August of 1952, those were by Pritchard, and other authors.

I am also familiar with the two books by Markley of the Southern Research Laboratory in New Orleans, dealing with the soybean and soybean products.

Q. What is the title of those books?

A. "Soybeans and Soybean Products."

Q. Have you made any chemical analyses of trichloroethylene extracted soybean oil?

A. Our laboratory has, yes.

Q. Have you made them of soybean oil meal, also?

A. Our laboratory has, yes.

Q. When you say "our laboratory", you mean the Barrow-Agee Laboratory?

A. That is right.

Q. And I believe you stated you are a consultant for that laboratory?

A. That's right.

Q. Now basing your opinion on your educational background, your past professional experience, the research you have testified to, the laboratory tests you have conducted, and all other information gained by you in your professional work, do you have what you consider a well-founded opinion upon the question of whether trichloroethylene extracted soybean oil meal, if fed over a substantial period of, say one or two months, is toxic to cattle?

A. I have.

Mr. Thomas:

If Your Honor please, we object, because of lack of qualifications of the witness as to toxicology in the field of causation.

The Court:

The objection is overruled.

(By Mr. Tavares):

Q. What is that opinion?

A. It is my opinion that in the processing of soybean meal by the trichloroethylene extraction processes, that a toxic material, which is poisonous, is produced.

Q. Now in your opinion, is raw soybean itself toxic to cattle when used as cattle feed?

A. No.

Q. In your opinion, is trichloroethylene, fed to cattle one to three ounces daily, toxic to cattle?

A. No.

Mr. Thomas:

If Your Honor please, may it be understood that we are objecting to all of this testimony?

The Court:

That's correct. That is, if you are objecting to it on the basis of lack of qualifications of the witness.

Mr. Thomas?

Yes, sir, we are objecting to it for lack of qualifications in the field of toxicology and causation.

The Court:

All right, sir. Go ahead.

(By Mr. Tavares):

Q. Doctor Vaughn, what, in your opinion, causes the toxicity of trichloroethylene processed soybean meal as cattle feed?

A. It is my opinion that in these processes, there are reactions occurring between the meal and the trichloroethylene which is toxic in the materials that are produced.

The Court:

Now let me ask the witness one question to clarify the situation with me, and possibly with the jury.

Doctor, as I understand you, then you say that the soybean itself is not poisonous?

The Witness:

That is correct.

The Court:

That the trichloroethylene itself might be fed to cattle in reasonable amounts and not be poisonous?

The Witness:

That is correct.

The Court:

But that in the extraction processes, a reaction takes place which does create a poison?

The Witness:

That is right.

(By Mr. Tavares):

Q. Will you state what experience, if any, you or your laboratory, Doctor, which I understand to be the Barrow-Agee Laboratory, have had in analyzing tri processed meal manufactured by Magnolia Soy Products Company of Greenville, Mississippi?

A. I understand our laboratory has analyzed a number of oil samples, and we have analyzed some of meal samples also.

Mr. Thomas:

If the Court please, we object to his "understanding", for the reason that it is hearsay.

(By Mr. Tavares):

Q. Now on what is that understanding based, Doctor?

A. The understanding is, the thing is, that many of these analyses were made before I joined the laboratory.

Mr. Thomas:

If the Court please, that is what we object to.

The Court:

That objection would be sustained, yes, sir, as to that part of the question.

Mr. Tavares:

Your Honor, I don't want to argue, but I would like to just state I was going to ask this witness whether in the regular course of business in his laboratory, he gained this information.

The Court:

I think he says they analyzed the meal after he came there. I think the other would be just hearsay, gentlemen, what he understood they had done.

(By Mr. Tavares):

Q. Doctor Vaughn, were any of the analyses made in the laboratory of soybean oil or soybean meal, made after you became a member of that laboratory, or an employee or consultant?

A. Yes, we analyzed soybean meal for the Magnolia Soy Products Company after I was employed by the Barrow-Agee Laboratory. As to oil, I don't recall that we analyzed any oil, but we did analyze meal.

The Court:

Let's go on with the meal, gentlemen. Oil is not primarily concerned with the matter here.

Mr. Tavares:

Will Your Honor, in the Court's ruling, just to clarigy this. Even if Doctor Vaughn was a member of the laboratory—

The Court:

I am holding it is competent for him to testify with respect to the meal analysis made after he came, but the oil analysis made before that time probably is not comptent; but it seems to me oil is not entering into this. It is the meal you are interested in, and I hold his testimony with respect to meal is competent.

(By Mr. Tavares):

Q. Doctor Vaughn, do you of your own knowledge—as I understand, do you know of your own knowledge of samples of soybean oil meal having been tested in the Barrow-Agee Laboratories?

Mr. Thomas:

If Your Honor please, we object to any testimony concerning analysis of meal unless it is shown to be the suspect meal in these three cases.

The Court:

I don't think that objection is well taken. This testimony shows, I think, without any contradiction at all, that the Magnolia soybean meal was made by some processes using trichloroethylene as a solvent. The objection is overruled.

(By Mr. Tavares):

Q. Well, Doctor, do you have what you consider a well-founded professional opinion as to whether whatever amounts of trichloroethylene were found in samples taken from Magnolia Soy Products Company's product, were in indicative in themselves of toxicity or non-toxicity of the meal?

A. I don't think the quantity of trichloroethylene you find is indicative of toxicity, but the fact that you find trichloroethylene being present at all indicates that process was used, and you would expect then a toxic product from the process.

Q. Doctor, please state what effect, if any, in your opinion, the temperature at which tri processed oil meal is processed, would have on the toxicity or non-toxicity of such meal as cattle feed?

A. Well, from a knowledge of chemistry, we usually—the reaction we expect—Let me put it this way. We expect reaction to take place at higher temperatures then low temperatures, and I would expect the temperature to have an effect on the material produced, and generally from our knowledge of chemistry, the higher the temperature, the greater quantity of reacting material is produced in a given quantity of time.

Q. Doctor Vaughn, do you know whether trichloroethylene is listed in the United States Pharmacopoeia?

A. Yes, sir, it is.

Q. Well, Doctor Vaughn, does that mean it is classed in the United States Pharmacopoeia as a drug?

A. That is my understanding.

Mr. Tavares:

No further questions, Your Honor.

The Court:

Very well. All right, gentlemen, you may cross examine.

Cross Examination.

By Mr. Thomas:

Q. If Your Honor please, Doctor Vaughn, have you personally witnessed, or has your laboratory under your supervision, ever performed or conducted any feed experiments with cattle where trichloroethylene extracted soybean meal was involved?

A. No, sir.

Q. So other than the articles you have mentioned and read off just now, have you read any other articles or studied any literature in regard to trichloroethylene?

A. Yes, sir; I have. These were just some of the articles.

Q. They were just some of them?

A. Yes, sir, that's right.

Q. Doctor, when did you read these articles that you testified about?

A. I read some of them back in 1952 when this problem came up. Others I read recently.

Q. All right, sir. Would you say in 1952 that you had read the article by Twehouse and Leasure, appearing in the November 21 issue of Veterinary Medicine?

A. No, sir.

Q. When did you read that?

A. Yesterday.

Q. Yesterday?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now with reference to the two articles appearing respectively in the July and August issues of The General American Veterinary Medicine?

A. That's right, yes, sir.

Q. When did you read those?

A. I read those yesterday.

Q. You mentioned an article by Stockman. Did you trace that reference out?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now that is where Stockman concluded that even cows fed one to three ounces of tri itself, it was not toxic or poisonous, is that right?

A. That's right, yes, sir.

Q. And that was over an extended period of time, too, wasn't it, Doctor?

A. That's right.

Q. That is what Stockman said, is that correct?

A. That is correct, yes.

Q. Now Doctor, do you recall this article by Twehouse and Leasure, that you said you read yesterday, now the main portion or the blocked-off portion there, didn't it state that many thousands of pounds had been fed satisfactorily to cattle over the past, without any ill results, isn't that right, sir?

A. I think in all of these articles that have been referred to, it has been stated that in not all cases where they were fed trichloroethylene extracted meal, that cows died. I think that is definitely stated.

Q. Didn't in fact, Doctor, the same articles refer to the fact that over sixty million pounds of trichloroethylene extracted soybean meal had been fed without any poisonous results; do you recall that?

A. I don't recall that.

Q. You don't recall that statement?

A. No, sir.

Q. But you do remember it stated that substantial quantities had been fed without any ill results, is that correct, sir.

A. I wouldn't say it stated "substantial quantities, but in reading these articles, the statement was made from time to time, that this meal had been fed to cattle from which no toxic results were obtained. It was not true in all cases. It depends upon the cattle and so forth.

Q. Doctor, you told us a moment ago about heat; would you say that heat is a variable in trying to isolate a toxic or poisonous factor, would you say you would like to know what the heat was?

A. No, not in isolation. I don't think so. No, I don't think I would be concerned with that.

Q. Well, Doctor, how do you attribute the fact that the literature says that many thousand pounds were fed to cattle with no ill results, and the fact that some died later on on certain outbreaks which occurred when some died, and others didn't?

A. I think that would be attributable to two things. One is the amount that was fed, and two, the condition of the cattle. I think that those in many instances show that greater quantities were fed them than in other instances.

Q. Are you telling us that heat processing had nothing at all to do with the creation of a toxic factor or not?

A. No, sir, I am not saying that. I think we do not know, except what is based on the theory of chemistry. I think that is all you could say as far as heat is concerned.

Q. By the way, is this determination in the field of chemistry or in the field of toxicology, what would you say to that?

A. I think it is—in the determination of toxic material, that would be chemistry, chemistry precedes toxicology. You must have a chemical analysis, you must isolate the material if you are going to determine what the material is, and then toxicology comes in there, of course, which would be the effects on the animals.

Q. Now Doctor, of course, as you have told us at Memphis, in your deposition, you are not a toxicologist?

A. That is right, sir.

Q. You told us that, didn't you?

A. Yes, I did, and I say now, No, I am not.

Q. Now to determine whether or not there is trichloroethylene present in the residual meal or not, that is a chemistry problem, is it not?

A. That's right.

Q. And that is what you were speaking of when you said your laboratories have analyzed some of Magnolia Soy Products Company's meal?

A. That's right.

Q. Now did you do that both quantitatively and qualitatively?

A. We do it quantitatively.

Q. You do it quantitatively?

A. That is correct.

Q. And that is a chemistry problem?

A. That is right.

Q. But you told us that you have not found trichloroethylene by itself to be poisonous to cows even though fed over an extended period of time, as all the literature bears out, is that correct?

A. Yes, sir, that is right.

Q. And you told us also that the soybean itself is not poisonous, is that right, sir?

A. Yes, sir, that's right.

Q. Now when you get into ascertaining when trichloroethylene, a non-poisonous substance, meets the soybean, another non-poisonous substance, is that in the field of chemistry or in the field of toxicology to determine whether or not it is a toxic reaction and what reaction takes place?

A. Well, I think that would be in the field of chemistry. I think I can give you an example of it.

Chlorine is a very toxic material. Sodium is a very reactive material. Chlorine would certainly come in the field of toxicology. You mention the two together, that is, mixed chlorine and sodium together, in a chemical laboratory, and you have ordinary sodium chloride, which is certainly non-poisonous.

Q. By the way, Doctor, what is table salt?

A. Sodium chloride.

Q. Sodium chloride; is that poisonous?

A. No.

Q. Isn't that a chlorine, isn't it out of the chlorine family?

A. That's right, sodium chloride, now it would be poisonous if taken in large amounts, and that is true to certain animals, but generally speaking, we consider it a non-poisonous material.

Q. Now taking ordinary table salt, Doctor, you could feed that even to human beings over a long period of time, and produce death, couldn't you?

A. Yes, I think—Well, there again you bring up this question of toxicity, and of course, it is a question of the material and of the nature of the poison that is in effect of it on the organisms, and I

think it is a real difference. I am sure that we all know that people cannot drink sea water out on the ocean, and it does, or in some cases, could produce death, but as we use it in ordinary living, of course it does not.

Q. Now Doctor, as a matter of fact, in the field of chemistry, even most any chemical you could take, if used in an unusual way for an extended period of time, you are telling us that it creates a toxic cindition?

A. Well, I think you would have to clarify "unusual way" in that case.

Q. Now Doctor, with reference to—you told us frankly you have never conducted any feed experiments with cattle, have you, yourself?

A. No, sir.

Q. And never has your laboratory, the Barrow-Agee Laboratory conducted such feed experiments, itself?

A. No, sir.

Q. And you have never witnessed any feeding tests with cattle with trichloroethylene extracted soybean meal, have you, Doctor?

A. No.

Q. And Doctor, have you made studies, I mean have you made studies with reference to guinea pigs or anything by feeding trichloroethylene extracted soybean meal to see what it will produce?

A. No, not actually made any experiments, no, sir.

Q. And as you told us in tracing out the reaction that might take place between the soybean and the trichloroethylene, that heat could be a variable, couldn't it, as to toxicity or not?

A. That is a question there, as far as heat is concerned, you would expect a reaction. Now let's answer it this way. We would expect a reaction to occur when the trichloroethylene and the soybean meal were mixed. Now from principles of chemistry, I would expect that same reaction to occur at a greater rate at higher temperatures.

Q. You mean that if even the heat was produced at over, say, 249 degrees Fahrenheit for, say, 30 minutes or more, that that would not have any effect on the so-called toxic principle?

A. That would depend a lot on your toxic material. Now, and in what you are basing your toxicology on of the formation of this material, but in general, from chemistry, I would not expect the heat to be the principal cause of whether you have a toxic material or do not have a toxic material, just from my knowledge of chemistry, I would not expect that to be the principal reason why you would have a toxic or a non-toxic material, when we are considering a reaction between trichloroethylene and the soybean meal. Now in general, I would expect, from my knowledge of trichloroethylene, I would expect a reaction to occur at the higher temperature rather than at the lower temperature. The more oil produced, let's say, it is a question of quantity here in a chemical reaction. The time that you have for the reaction to occur in the process.

Q. Doctor, are you telling us that heat does not have anything at all to do with it?

A. No, I am not saying that. What I am saying is, according to chemistry, that I would not expect it to be the controlling factor, if that is what you are trying to say, that heat is the controlling factor. I wouldn't expect it to be.

Q. Would you expect it to be in a combination with other factors to throw it one way or the other?

A. No, I don't think I could say, I wouldn't say.

Q. And Doctor, you frankly say you have never witnessed the reaction between the soybean, made in the chemistry tests in that connection, between soybean and trichloroethylene, is that right?

A. No, sir, we carried no experiments dealing with that, no, sir.

Q. And your sole information is that gathered from the literature as to any reactions that might take place between the two articles?

A. That, and my knowledge of just trichloroethylene. I think if you studied the nature of that molecule and its chemical properties, I think you could see what you would expect, you would see that you would expect certain reactions, and those could be enumerated, and I think if you have the conditions whereby any two materials will react, say, with the protein in the soybean meal, that then you have a condition for producing a substance which could be toxic.

Q. How about the age of the bean, whether it is mature or green, would that be a variable, also?

A. I think it could be, yes.

Q. As a matter of fact, this literature you spoke of mentioned that as being a variable, didn't it?

A. Not that I recall. I think they did mention this, that in some feeding experiments, they had fed spoiled soybeans, and yet there were no effects.

Q. No what?

A. No effects on the cattle when even fed spoiled soybeans.

Q. That was spoiled soybean extracted—

A. No, no, not extracted soybean meal. We were just talking about soybeans at this time now, and

after they had fed spoiled soybeans, there was no effect in this particular case.

Q. Doctor, what is the characteristic odor of trichloroethylene?

A. Oh, it's a sweet—in chemistry, we think of it as being a sort of sweet odor similar to other chlorinated hydrocarbons of that nature.

Q. I believe, Doctor, in your Memphis deposition taken April 8, 1953, in the case of Ladner Vs. Du Pont, that you testified when questioned, a question by Mr. Williams, that was referring to a question I asked you, he asked you also if the amount of trichloroethylene that you found in this sample was sufficient to poison cattle, that you answered as follows:

"I am not prepared to answer that question, as I have no knowledge of the toxicity."

Do you recall that question?

A. At that time, that was right.

Q. And you never witnessed or conducted any experiments since that time yourself, have you?

A. No.

Q. In feeding animals?

A. No. The statement we made was based on Stockman's Report, which I have read since that time.

Q. Yes, sir. Now Doctor, didn't you also say, and I quote,

"I read the Twehouse and Leasure articles in the Veterinary Medicine, the issue of November, 1951."

Didn't you say that at that time?

A. No, sir.

Q. You did not?

A. No.

Q. Doctor, when you got your Ph.D., or prior thereto, had extensive studies been made by you as to trichloroethylene?

A. No, I did not, no, sir.

Q. Sir?

A. The answer is no.

Q. You hadn't made any extensive studies at that time?

A. No.

Q. Doctor, what is the toxic factor produced by these two non-toxic factors, namely soybeans meeting or coming in contact with trichloroethylene?

A. I don't know. I don't have any information as to what the toxic factor is. I presume you mean the poisonous material?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. No. I don't know what it is.

Q. You do not know?

A. No, sir.

Q. Is the determination of that a matter or chemistry or toxicology?

A. It would first be chemistry, it must be isolated, first, but you could go out and feed it to all kinds of animals and study the effects on those animals, but you would never know what your toxic material is until some chemist isolates it and analyzes it. That must be done first.

Q. You say chemistry must come first?

A. Yes, sir, chemistry must precede toxicology if you are going to put your finger on the materials.

Now the toxicologist says, "We think it is this, we think it is that, or we think it is this, from the symptoms", but chemistry must isolate the material first

Now that statement was based on the assumption that the toxicologist had a knowledge of toxicology, you understand what I mean. I'm speaking of the one who says that we think it's this or that, but as I said a moment ago, he must find it there and than determine what type of material it is. A toxicologist would never do that. That is a chemist's job.

Q. Even in the field of chemistry, Doctor, the question I asked you just now was, "Is a toxic factor produced by the two non-poisonous factors" and you can't tell us that?

A. Now let's look at it this way; the chemist will have to isolate the material, then that material would have to be fed to animals, and that's where the toxicologist would come in.

Q. All right, sir.

A. To feed it them you would decide from these feeding experiments and from the materials which the chemist isolated, what the toxic material was. That would be the procedure which I think would be followed in isolating the materials first.

Q. But frankly, you tell us that you never tried to isolate—

A. Oh, no, I haven't.

Q. And you never tried to determine the toxic factor, whether it is in chemistry or in toxicology?

A. No, we had no reason to do that. That's right.

Q. And you frankly told us you haven't conducted or witnessed any feeding experiments with animals, have you?

A. No, sir, I have not.

Q. With trichloroethylene extracted soybean meal?

A. That's right, I have not.

Q. And you do not know, as you tell us today, what the toxic factor is, do you, Doctor?

A. No, sir, not what the toxic material is; no, that's right.

Mr. Thomas:
That is all.

The Court:
Is there any further examination of this witness?

Mr. Tavares:
Just one or two questions, if Your Honor please.

Re-Direct Examination.

By Mr. Tavares:

Q. Doctor Vaughn, in what field did you get your Ph.D. degree, in what field did you study for your thesis and so forth?

A. Physical and analytical chemistry.

Q. Physical and analytical chemistry?

A. Yes, sir, that's right.

Q. Doctor, does that have anything to do with hydrocarbons?

A. Yes, my Ph.D. research was in the field of hydrocarbons, that's right.

Q. And is trichloroethylene a hydrocarbon?

A. Trichloroethylene is a chlorinated hydrocarbon.

Q. Now Doctor, your testimony in this case, your opinions have been based on your knowledge, and in what field, the toxicology field or the chemistry field, or what field?

A. They have been based on my knowledge of trichloroethylene and the materials that occur in soybean meal, that is, I can see you could produce from those two materials. I don't think this would be very difficult at all for a chemist to see that you could produce toxic materials from those two.

Q. And on what background is that based?

A. On a knowledge of the chemical properties of trichloroethylene.

Mr. Tavares:
That is all.

Mr. Thomas:
That's all we have.

Mr. Tavares:
You may step down.

(Witness excused.)

* * * * * * * *

Mr. Thomas:
Now, if Your Honor please, as long as plaintiffs have now rested their case, and defendant Du Pont at this time would like now, and does now, if Your Honor please, move for a directed verdict at the close of the plaintiffs' case, and to save time and to save oral dictation into the record of the specific grounds of such motion made in each of the three cases, we have prepared written motions of defendant for a directed verdict in each of the three cases, which we would like to file with the reporter and with the clerk of Court to save time, if Your Honor please, setting out the various grounds, and we will give Mr. Brooks, Mr. Tavares, Mr. Burgin, and Mr. Kashiwa, copies. If the Court will permit us to do it that way; otherwise, we can dictate it in the record.

The Court:
Yes, just file it, and let's get through with it.

Mr. Thomas:

I might say that this motion in each of the three cases, asking for a directed verdict in favor of this defendant in this cause as to all counts in the complaint, or the entire complaint, if Your Honor please, and I refer to the first motion.

We would like to file with the reporter and the clerk, this prepared motion.

The Court:

All right, sir, go ahead.

(Motion for directed verdict received and filed.)

Mr. Thomas:

If Your Honor please, I believe you said we could file these?

The Court:

Yes, sir.

Mr. Thomas:

Well, if Your Honor please, we now, pursuant to the permission of this Honorable Court, now file with the reporter, in each of the three cases, a motion entitled "Motion of Defendant for a Directed Verdict," which is moved for at the close of the plaintiffs' case, and we ask for a directed verdict as to the entire complaint, and all counts therein on the specific grounds therein specifically set forth.

Do you want to hear me on this, Your Honor?

* * * * * * * *

There is a question in this case which I think would be a question for the jury, as to whether or not Du

Pont sufficiently gave warning to the Magnolia Soy Products Company, that this theory had been found full of errors, and that there was danger in this feeding. That, I think, is for the jury, and if it may become a question for the jury, I don't think it would be at this stage, but it may become a question for the jury as to whether the chemical trichloroethylene was the toxic cause of the deaths of these cattle, but in this view, Du Pont, having knowingly furnished this chemical for this use, knowing that it would go into the processes of making soybean meal, and their theory about the matter, however sincere and honest they may have been in it, proving to have been false, that is a jury issue, and the motion for a directed verdict would be overruled.

Mr. Thomas:

If the Court please, the first motion for a directed verdict made in each of the three cases, now Du Pont follows that up with a motion for a directed verdict made at the close of plaintiffs' case, asking this Honorable Court to direct a verdict in favor of the defendant in this cause as to Counts One, Two and Three of the Complaint herein and referred to as the Contract. Now the grounds are all set forth in our written motion in this regard, which we should like to ask permission of this Honorable Court to file with the reporter and the clerk instead of reading it, as we have done heretofore.

The Court:

That is all right, sir. Now as to that last motion, gentlemen, didn't you gentlemen for the plaintiff withdraw one of those counts?

Mr. Thomas:

If Your Honor please, Mr. Brooks of Counsel for the Plaintiffs, has now told this Honorable Court, I believe, as I now recall, that Count Three, which count is on the expressed warranty theory, is now withdrawn, and hence that being so, we move to delete that number, as to the expressed warranty. We intend to withdraw that, since the plaintiffs have withdrawn that count, and that is, as I understand, being done by the plaintiffs.

Mr. Brooks:

That is correct.

Mr. Thomas:

Count Three on the expressed warranty theory now having been withdrawn from this case in each of the three cases, defendant Du Pont now, therefore, wishes to delete from its motion for a directed verdict as to the dismissal of Counts One, Two and Three, the number and word "Three", inasmuch as Count Three is no longer applicable in this case, and if Your Honor please, we would like to file with the reporter such written motion setting out these specific grounds.

The Court:

All right, sir, you may do that.

Mr. Tavares:

Your Honor, at the time I rewrote this or retyped our amended complaint, I felt I ought to include that Count Three as a matter of simple regularity, and it is still in there. Does the Court wish me to leave it out in this redraft? I can have it redrafted to do that.

The Court:

Well, I think it would be very well to leave it out. I don't know that it makes any difference since you now state that it is out, but I think the record would look better if it were taken out.

* * * * * * * *

The Court:

Well, Mr. Thomas, do you have any different position about this particular motion than you had about the other?

Mr. Thomas:

None except, if Your Honor please, what we argued at Oxford on the motion for summary judgment, as Your Honor will recall, as the count now appears in the record, why it is the contract account, and we think that privity of contract is an essential consideration. It is essentially a reliance, and essentially the essence of all which we respectfully submit is missing in this case. That is the difference.

The Court:

That motion would be denied.

* * * * * * * *

FRANK McDONALD, a witness called by and on behalf of the defendants, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Direct Examination.

By Mr. Thomas:

Q. This is Mr. Frank L. McDonald?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Speak out louder, Mr. McDonald.
A. Yes, sir, I am Frank L. McDonald.
Q. Where do you live, Mr. McDonald?
A. Clarksdale, Mississippi.
Q. How old are you?
A. 39.
Q. By whom are you presently employed?
A. Planters Manufacturing Company of Clarksdale.

Mr. Brooks:
What was that name please?

The Witness:
Planters Manufacturing Company, Clarksdale, Mississippi.

(By Mr. Thomas):
Q. And what is their business, Mr. McDonald?
A. They manufacture cottonseed and soybean products.
Q. For how long a period of time have you been employed by Planters Manufacturing Company?
A. Four years.
Q. And how long have you been engaged in oil seed crushing and extracting business?
A. Approximately 10 years.
Q. Approximately 10 years?
A. That's right, sir.
Q. Where did you first start such employment?
A. Delta Products, Wilson, Arkansas.
Q. Is that the name of the concern now?
A. No, sir; it is the Evadale Buckeye, that's a Procter and Gamble plant.
Q. And how long were you with Delta Products?
A. Approximately four years.

Q. And how were you employed by that concern?

A. I started out with them as plant operator; then I was plant maintenance man.

Q. Yes, sir. Now what kind of extraction method did they use, or expeller method?

A. They used prepressed operation expeller and hexane extractor.

Q. Now after you left the Delta Products of Wilson, Arkansas, where did you next come for employment?

A. Magnolia Soy, Greenville, Mississippi.

Q. That is the Magnolia Soy Products Company of Greenville, Mississippi?

A. Yes, sir, that's right.

Q. All right, sir. Do you know whether it had been incorporated as a corporation when you first came here or not?

A. I don't know that, no, sir.

Q. You don't know about that?

A. No, I don't.

Q. Now before you came to Greenville for employment with them, had you known Mr. L. L. Ford and Mr. Lyman Reed?

A. I knew Mr. Reed; I knew of Mr. Ford.

Q. All right, sir; where was the first time you met Mr. Ford, where was it?

A. I met him at a convention in Memphis, a regional meeting.

Q. Yes, sir; now do you recall the date that you arrived at Greenviell for emplloyment here?

A. The 10th of December, 1950.

Q. 1950? The 10th of December?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what capacity were you employed at Greenville?

A. As Plant Superintendent.

Q. What was the condition or status of the plant, with reference to its being finished, or in the process of construction, or otherwise?

A. It was in the process of construction, and about five per cent completed at the time, oh, possibly it was ten per cent completed at that time.

Q. About when was the plant of Magnolia Soy Products Company here at Greenville, completed, Mr. McDonald?

A. The latter part of February.

Q. Of 19—what?

A. 1951.

Q. 1951?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you familiar at that time with a design known as the Crown Iron Works design?

A. Yes, sir, I knew of it.

Q. Had you known, were you then familiar with what is known as the Detrex, D-e-t-r-e-x design?

A. Just through magazines was all I had on that. I had seen sketches of it like that.

Q. What plant design was being used at the Greenville plant of the Magnolia Soy Products Company?

A. The Bollman design, which is a basket extractor.

Q. Now that Bollman, would you spell that, please, sir?

A. B-o-l-l-m-a-n, Bollman.

Q. It is a Bollman what?

A. It is a Bollman design, basket extractor.

Q. A Bollman design basket extractor?

A. That's right.

Q. Now who was in charge of that design?

A. Mr. Ford, as far as I know.

Q. Is that the same Mr. L. L. Ford you referred to a moment ago?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What would you say as to that design being a standard design, or a design peculiar to Magnolia Soy Products Company, or otherwise?

A. It was largely peculiar to Magnolia. It was not similar to the ones I had seen before, only in the fact that it was a basket extractor.

Q. The record shows that a corporation known as Magnolia Soy Products Company was formed sometime in January or February of 1951; you don't know anything about the details of the incorporation?

A. Not the details; Mr. Warren just called me in and told me it had been done.

Q. Now who is Mr. Warren that you referred to?

A. Mr. Warren is James Warren, who came here from Texas and backed the building of the plant.

Q. Do you know what position he occupied with Magnolia Soy Products Company?

A. He was President of it.

Q. President?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what position did Mr. L. L. Ford occupy?

A. He was Vice-President.

Q. And what position did Mr. Lyman Reed occupy?

A. He was Secretary.

Q. Who had charge of sales?

A. Mr. Reed.

Q. Mr. Reed?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And your job with Magnolia Soy Products Company was Plant Superintendent, is that correct, sir?

A. That's right.

Q. All right, sir; then how long a period of time did you remain as Plant Superintendent of Magnolia Soy Products Company, Mr. McDonald?

A. Until September 24, 1951.

Q. And where did you go then?

A. I went down to Craig Field at Selma, Alabama, to a pilot instruction school.

Q. You went to a pilot instruction school?

A. That's right.

Mr. Brooks:

Where?

Mr. Thomas:

He said he went to Craig Field at Selma, Alabama.

Q. When did you first meet, if you did meet, Mr. R. Stuart Armstrong of the Du Pont Company?

A. In the early part of 1951. I wouldn't say for sure just when, but I believe it was in January.

Q. About what per cent of the plant of Magnolia Soy Products Company was completed when you first met Mr. Armstrong, Mr. McDonald?

A. I would say sixty or seventy-five per cent.

Q. Do you recall what was the occasion of Mr. Armstrong's first visit to the plant of Magnolia Soy Products Company?

A. You mean the reason for his being there?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. To see how the distillation system was coming along, that he was more or less interested in supervising.

Q. Did you say of the distillation system?

A. Yes, sir, the distillation part of the extractor system.

Q. The what?

A. The distillation part of the extraction system.

Q. The distillation part of the extraction system, you said?

A. That's right.

Q. All right, sir; now right before Mr. Armstrong came, what effort, if any, had been made to start up the plant and the results?

A. Now do I understand you right—

Q. With reference to equipment, had any starting up processes started before Mr. Armstrong came down the first time?

A. No, we were not able to start. We hadn't finished building the plant then.

Q. I see. All right, sir, now when Mr. Armstrong came down what recommendation, if any, did he have concerning the distillation system or any part of the plant?

A. Well, some of our pumps, when he finally inspected them, were not holding the Tri, they were leaking pretty badly.

Q. Some of your pumps?

A. Yes, sir, they were leaking.

Q. You say they were leaking pretty badly?

A. That's right.

Q. Now what has that pump to do with reference to the distillation or the recovery, or the extraction system?

A. The pumps put the solvent over the soybean flakes, and then they pick up the miscella which is your oil and solvent combination, and send that on through your distillation system.

Mr. Brooks:

Your Honor, would you have the witness speak just slightly louder?

The Court:

Speak just a little louder, Mr. McDonald.

(By Mr. Thomas):

Q. Is that miscella that you referred to?

A. Yes, sir, miscella.

Q. How would you spell that, please, sir, for the benefit of me and the jury?

A. That's spelled m-i-s-c-e-l-l-a.

Q. All right, sir, now what did you say about this miscella and the pump?

A. The pumps are used to pump miscella through your filter and on through your distillation system.

The Court:

Now let me get for my benefit and the jury's, this miscella that you speak of, as I understand it, that is the oil which has come from the beans, mixed with the solvent?

The Witness:

That is correct, yes, sir.

The Court:

And that is the mixture which goes on through your distillation system?

The Witness:

Yes, sir, that is approximately an 80-20 mixture, with the 80 per cent of it being solvent, and 20 per cent of it being oil. That is not a cut and dried percentage, but we try to maintain that.

(By Mr. Thomas):

Q. Now that which you have told His Honor about is what you referred to as "miscella", is it not?

A. That's right.

Q. All right, sir; now what recommendations concerning these pumps, if any, did Mr. Armstrong make?

A. He said we should have different type pumps, which I also agreed with him myself, because the ones we had, we could not make work properly.

Q. Now what was the solvent in use at the Magnolia Soy Products plant at that time?

A. Trichloroethylene.

Q. Trichloroethylene?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you sometimes shorten that as "Tri"?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. All right, sir; was that the only visit made by Mr. Armstrong to Magnolia's plant in 1951?

A. No, sir, he was down there three or four times, to my knowledge.

Q. Now what happened after the plant started up, Mr. McDonald, did anything out of the ordinary occur?

A. Well, we hadn't been running very long before the pumps started leaking, and we had a slight explosion with our toaster.

Q. Now, what do you mean by "our toaster"; what is its function, what does it perform?

A. Well, when your flakes are extracted in the extraction column, the spent flakes are discharged into a desolventizer-type toaster. The top part of your toaster, or desolventizer is used to desolventize the flakes, and the bottom part of it does your meal, and sends it on to your grinding plant.

Q. Yes, sir, and what happened to this toaster or desolventizer, Mr. McDonald?

A. Well, we had been down for a short period of time, and when we started up, charred meal got around the hub in the bottom of one of our kettles—

Mr. Brooks:

We object to that, Your Honor. It is hearsay. Apparently he is drawing a conclusion. There is no evidence to show that there was any charred meal in that extractor.

May I ask the witness one question, Mr. Thomas, just to clear this up?

Mr. Thomas:

Why certainly.

(By Mr. Brooks):

Q. Is that true, sir?

A. No, sir, it was in there because I opened it up.

Q. Did you know before the explosion that charred meal was there?

A. Not before, we didn't, no. We didn't know it was there until after we opened it up.

Mr. Brooks:

I think that clarifies it, and thank you, Mr. Thomas.

(By Mr. Thomas):

Q. And after you opened it up, what did you find?

A. We found charred meal around the hub on one of the sleeves.

Q. Now what heaters, if any, did this plant have out there?

A. We had a home-made space heater in there.

Q. A home-made space heater?

A. Yes, sir, fired by gas.

Q. And was it in use or not?

A. Yes, sir, it was in use; it was quite cold while we were carrying on that operation.

Q. Now did Mr. Ford know of its use?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. What, if anything, had Mr. Ford said about this particular heater, as to whether it should be used or not?

A. He said it would be all right, that there wasn't any danger from it.

Q. Mr. McDonald, do you recall anything being said about the use of this space heater, anything being said by Mr. Armstrong to Mr. Ford?

A. He strongly recommended discontinuance of the use of that heater.

Q. And why wasn't it discontinued?

A. Well, Mr. Ford didn't seem to think it was necessary.

Q. Now after this explosion which you referred to and about which you have mentioned charred meal being found in the desolventizer, was there any other explosions at the plant?

A. Shortly after that, there was another one.

Q. About what month in the year was it?

A. I believe it was in March, the latter part of March.

Q. Of 1951?

A. Yes, sir, 1951.

Q. Well, would you tell us about that explosion, please, sir?

A. I had gone to town and had left orders for the boys to drill a hole through the side of the extractor column. It was full of vapors at the time, and the liquid level in that particular column is only a foot or a foot and a half deep, but the column itself is about 45 feet high, and 15 feet one way, and eight feet the other, rectangular-shaped. Of course, it was full of vapors, and I was afraid to burn into the side of that column, so I had left orders for the men to

drill a hole through the side to make a connection for my miscella pump, to recirculate miscella back into the bottom of the extractor, and thereby to obtain a higher compensation; and while I was gone, Mr. Ford gave one of my men orders to cut it in there and save time, with an acetylene torch.

Q. What, if anything, had Mr. Armstrong had to tell Mr. Ford about using acetylene torches in there?

A. He told him not to use it under any circumstances until the plant was purged.

Q. And what do you mean by "purged", by the plant being completely purged?

A. Cleared of tri vapors and any presence of tri.

Q. All right, sir; now what observation did you, as plant superintendent, make as to the method of cooking the meal out there in the plant?

A. Well, to insure that there would be no urease activity, I wanted to keep that toaster up to at least 240 degrees for 20 to 30 minutes, which would ordinarily insure urease inactivity.

Q. Now did you comply with that out there, or what happened out there?

A. No, sir, we didn't keep the temperature up.

Q. Why?

A. Well, the toaster, in the first place, when they first started operations with it, we had six rings on that toaster, and they were trapped out, one trapped to two rings each, and one of the rings was not getting sufficient discharge through the traps to keep it hot like it should be. We later changed that to six traps, with one trap for each ring.

Q. What information, if any, did Mr. Ford have about these traps you speak of?

A. Well, he said it was all right, but it later proved that it was not. The traps were all right in themselves, but there wasn't enough of them.

Q. And what did you have to say about the temperature, about being able to obtain and maintain temperature, what did you say about that?

A. Well, we just couldn't do it.

Q. You couldn't do it?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now about how often were you able to obtain and maintain this temperature you spoke of for the period of time you spoke of?

A. Oh, maybe 10 per cent of the time, maybe when we were coming up with small loads.

Q. Coming up with what?

A. With small loads.

Q. Small loads?

A. Yes, sir, not to capacity.

Q. All right, sir. Now what, if anything, did Mr. Ford have to tell you, Mr. McDonald, about production, or trying to attain a certain amount of production?

A. Well, he wanted to get it up. Originally we tried to get around a hundred tons a day, but that was impossible, and then we tried to settle for around 60 to 70 tons a day.

Q. What, if any, conversation did you have, or did Mr. Ford have with you, concerning that requested production?

A. Well, he wanted to hold it up.

Q. He wanted to hold it up?

A. Yes, sir, Mr. Ford did.

Q. Did you have anything to tell Mr. Ford about that?

A. Well, we couldn't hold that production and come out with a quality product.

Q. And by "quality", you are referring to what product?

A. In particular, being able to hold our toaster up to the proper temperature for proper cooking procedure.

Q. And that proper temperature was what?

A. We always tried to maintain 240 degrees minimum at the bottom.

Q. For how long?

A. From 20 to 30 minutes.

Q. Was that continuous or sporadic or what?

A. Well, it was sporadic with us, but it should have been continuous.

Q. Now what capacity—What original capacity was the plant designed for, how many tons per day?

A. Originally, it was designed for from 90 to 100 tons a day.

Q. Now what statements, if any, did Mr. Ford make to you, Mr. McDonald, about this meal being sold for cattle feed, or did you make to him in that regard?

A. Well, I had had conversations with a consulting engineer in Memphis, and knew that it would possibly be dangerous if that meal was sold for cattle feed that there would be cattle deaths as a result.

Mr. Brooks:

I object to that, Your Honor. The witness is not qualified to express an opinion on the subject of the results of feeding that meal and it causing deaths of cattle.

The Court:

Well, I think it is perfectly competent for him to state that he had some information it was dangerous. That's all the statement he has made so far. Go ahead.

(By Mr. Thomas):

Q. Then, Mr. McDonald, what statements, if any, did you make to Mr. Ford, or he to you, about that meal being sold for cattle food?

A. I recommended to Mr. Ford and Mr. Reed and Mr. Warren that it not be sold for cattle feed.

Q. What did Mr. Ford or any one else there in your presence, tell you?

A. Mr. Ford and Mr. Reed both assured Mr. Warren that it would be all right.

Q. Mr. Ford and Mr. Reed assured Mr. Warren it was all right?

A. Yes, sir.

The Court:

Let me ask this witness a question right here for my own benefit and for the benefit of this jury.

Was your question directed to these gentlemen based on the idea that soybean meal made by the Tri processes was in itself dangerous, is that what you had heard?

A. Now let me see if I understand you. You mean when I told them it should not be sold as cattle feed?

The Court:

Yes, sir.

The Witness:

I told them that I assumed it was dangerous for cattle feed.

The Court:

Was that because it was being made with the Tri processes?

The Witness:

Indirectly, yes, sir. It had never been proven that Tri was directly the cause, but as a result of the use, there was enough evidence against using it to make me think it was dangerous.

The Court:

All right. I see what your attitude is. Go ahead.

(By Mr. Thomas):

Q. Now with reference to its use for hogs and poultry feed, and urease, did you and Mr. Ford have any conversations about that?

A. Well, for feeding, it wants to be inactive in urease, because it will cause death in chickens, if you are using it for poultry feed, if the urease is active.

Q. After this second explosion caused by the acetylene torch, you testified about, did Mr. Armstrong have an occasion to visit your plant there, after that?

A. Yes, sir, he was there.

Q. About what time, if you recall, was it that he was there.

A. It was in the latter part of March. I don't recall the exact date.

Q. In 1951?

A. In 1951.

Q. And do you recall anything about a fire in any of the beans down at the plant?

A. Yes, sir, we had a slight conflagration one morning about six o'clock; some of the meal caught fire.

Q. And what was the cause of that, what was the fire caused from?

A. Well, that was caused from the meal. The meal was sacked while it was pretty hot, and the moisture

content was high, and it had been left there for a period of over two weeks, that particular meal, and it was the stuff that had gone through the toaster, at too low a heat to warrant sending it out, what was there, and it was damaged meal anyway, and it caught fire.

Q. All right, sir, and about how many bushels, if you know, were damaged or burned?

A. Oh, I'd say 150 sacks.

Q. 150 sacks?

A. Yes, sir, that's about right.

Q. What use, if any, was made out of those burned beans or part of them?

A. The beans that were damaged and could not be processed, were ran through, and we sold them as fertilizer.

Q. Do you recall seeing Mr. Stuart Armstrong down there at the plant sometime about the first of August, 1951, Mr. McDonald?

A. Yes, sir, he was there.

Q. Do you know who he saw at that plant?

A. He saw Mr. Ford and Mr. Reed both.

Q. All right, sir; and you saw him at that time, too?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would you tell us whether or not you were in on a discussion of a letter, do you know anything about a letter dated July 31, 1951?

A. No, sir, I was not in on that.

Q. Now when was the next time that Mr. Armstrong made a visit to Magnolia, that you recall, after the August visit?

A. When was he next visiting us?

Q. Yes, did he make another visit after that August visit while you were still at the plant?

A. Not that I recall.

Q. All right, sir; now what was being done in the month of August in 1951, was that the month in the plant's operation when you were making Tri extracted soybean meal or not?

A. No, sir, we were running out the bad beans.

Q. You were running out what?

A. The bad beans, the beans that had got damaged or burned, we were running them out for fertilizer. Those that were all burnt up, you know.

Q. And selling it as what?

A. Selling it as a fertilizer.

Q. You were selling those burned beans as fertilizer?

A. That's right.

Q. And you left, I believe you testified, to go to Craig Field when?

A. On the 24th of September, as near as I can remember.

Q. Did you personally know, not what you heard, but did you personally know of any other matter occurring at the Magnolia Soy Products Company after you left?

A. There was another explosion and fire, the first of November.

Q. Now did you talk to Mr. Ford about that explosion and fire, or to Mr. Reed, or to anyone else?

A. No, sir, I didn't talk about it. I came back before that.

Q. You came back along after it happened?

A. The next day.

Q. You got back to the plant the next day after this last explosion and fire?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know what happened out at the plant?

A. There was another explosion at the plant.

Q. There was another explosion?
A. Yes, sir, in the extraction column.
Q. The extraction column?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You saw that, did you?
A. I saw it after it had been done, yes, sir.
Q. Did anybody get hurt?
A. A man got killed.
Q. Do you know the nature of the equipment after that explosion, what happened to it, whether it was damaged or not?
A. The extractor column was ripped wide open.
Q. Mr. McDonald, are you familiar and were you familiar then, with a magazine or trade journal called "Feed Stuffs"?
A. Yes, sir, we received that magazine.
Q. By "we", do you mean Magnolia Soy Products Company subscribed to that magazine?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now in the year 1951, they did?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. All right, sir; now do you know whether or not Magnolia Soy Products Company subscribed to another magazine known as "Soybean Digest"?
A. Yes, sir, we had that one there, too.
Q. Do you recall whether any article or p cture appeared in that magazine with reference to Magnolia Soy Products Company?
A. No, sir, I don't recall about that.
Q. All right, sir; now during the time you were plant superintendent of Magnolia Soy Products Company, what labels did Magnolia have, if any, on its soybean meal, concerning its use or not, as cattle feed.

A. None, as I recall. They just used the standard label giving the fat content and the protein content, and so forth, and the fact that it was a solvent extracted product.

Mr. Thomas:
That is all, if the Court please.

The Court:
Very well, sir. You may cross examine.

Cross Examination.

By Mr. Brooks:

Q. Mr. McDonald, prior to going with the Magnolia Soy Products Company in December of 1950, had you worked with any other processing meal plant that used the tri as a solvent?

A. No, sir.

Q. Had you ever been through such a plant?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you actually see the Crown Iron Works?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you see it in operation?

A. No, sir.

Q. So actually when you went to Magnolia Soy Products Company, you had no previous experience whatever with regard to the Tri processes, had you?

A. No, sir, that's right.

Q. You were there in December of 1950 for the purpose of assisting in the construction of this plant?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now during that period, from December until the plant actually went into operation, did you make any suggestion as plant superintendent, with regard to the equipment that was being installed there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Prior to the plant's actually going into operation?

A. Yes, sir, that's right.

Q. I see. Now you said that the Magnolia Soy Products plant was peculiar, that the equipment was peculiar to that plant, now if you hadn't seen any other Tri plant, on what do you base your opinion, that the Magnolia plant was exceptional or peculiar?

A. Well, I had access to drawings and sketches of other plants that were using that type extractor that we used, and the entry system was not anything like what other basket extractors used. That is what I had reference to in particular.

Q. Well, what other plants, drawings of what other plants, did you have reference to?

A. Well, French,—French Machinery makes a basket extractor,—French Oil Mill Machinery.

Q. What did you do about the pumps that you have testified were leaking, prior to going into production?

A. Nothing prior to going into production. It was after we got in production.

Q. How long after?

A. I'd say about a month or six weeks.

Q. A month or six weeks?

A. Something like that.

Q. You actually were in production and the pumps were still leaking?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now those pumps, were they affecting the heat?

A. Would they affect the heat?

Q. Would the leaking pumps have anything to do with the quality of the meal?

A. I would say not, no, sir.

Q. That's what I thought.

A. The only way they would have,—Let me modify that statement this way; the leaking pumps would leak enough solvent to where you could not hold your concentration like you wanted, and maybe get your oil content like you wanted. That would be all, it would have nothing to do with the meal being toasted, or anything like that.

Q. Then it wouldn't have anything to do with the meal itself?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, you have mentioned a space heater. Did that have anything to do with the operation of the mill?

A. Not on the production end at all, no, sir, nothing.

Q. It had nothing whatever to do with the production of meal?

A. That wasn't, no, sir.

Q. That was a matter of personal comfort, was it not?

A. Well, it had only to do with safety, that's all.

Q. Now you state that the heat should be 240 degrees, I assume that is Fahrenheit?

A. Yes, sir, that's right.

Q. On what do you base that experience?

A. That was from previous experiences in that field.

Q. Why, didn't you just say you had no previous experience with Tri?

A. Not with Tri, but I have had experience with hexane, which is very similar.

Q. Why did you say 240 degrees would have to be maintained, 240 degrees in this particular process?

A. To make sure the urease activity is made inactive.

Q. Do you consider the urease activity an indication of the heating of that meal?

A. Absolutely.

Q. It would be an indication of the heat, wouldn't it?

A. That's right.

Q. All right, sir. I show you Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 11. Now this has been introduced in evidence, and I'll ask you to please read at the bottom of the page, of the Whitten-Tenent Laboratory Report on Magnolia Soy Products meal; what is that statement right there, Mr. McDonald?

A. "Urease activity negative indicates meal has been properly cooked".

That's just what I told you.

Q. Now according to what you have just said, that meant that the heat had to be 240 degrees, is that true?

A. Not necessarily. That is what we try to maintain. It could possibly be a little less, but that assures urease inactivity.

Q. Well, if it were a degree or two, but the heat itself had to be approximately 240 degrees, and if they had not maintained it at that figure, why this statement would not have appeared, because the urease would have shown in the test, wouldn't it?

A. That's right, for that particular time. Now that may be for just a 24 hour operation.

Q. Yes, sir. Now with regard to the second explosion; you gave the order to burn that hole in that column, did you not?

A. No, I did not. I gave the order for it to be drilled through the side with a drill, with oil kept on the drill, soybean oil, to be specific.

Q. Weren't you present at the time that that hole was made in that extractor column?

A. No, sir, I was not, but I had left orders for it to be drilled through the side with oil kept on the drill. I had gone to town.

Q. Didn't you testify in the Ladner case that: "We were burning a hole in that pump"?

A. Absolutely not.

Q. Now with regard to the traps, how many steam traps did you have when the plant went into operation?

A. Three.

Q. And your recommendation was what?

A. To put individual traps on each ring.

Q. That would be how many traps?

A. Six.

Q. Six?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And if six traps were installed, didn't you make the statement that you could maintain the proper heat, or at least the heat you considered proper?

A. Yes, sir, if we put through the proper tonnage.

Q. Weren't those additional traps installed?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And after the installation of these traps, was the proper heat maintained?

A. Not always.

Q. In other words, after your recommendation as to the steam traps had been carried out, and you said in your opinion as the plant superintendent, you could maintain those heats or what you considered appropriate heats, yet after they were installed then you still say now that you could not get the heat you desired and maintain it?

A. Not always, because we tried to put through more than it would take. In other words, we increased the capacity

Q. Well, didn't you know at the time that you recommended the six traps this would be done?

A. Well, absolutely, and I told the people about it, and I told Mr. Ford, he knew about it, and I told Mr. Reed we couldn't increase the capacity and maintain the heats.

Q. But your recommendation was carried out, sir, wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir, over their objections.

Q. But it was done, that's the important part.

A. That's right.

Q. Now will you state at approximately what time those traps were put in, the additional steam traps?

A. I would say we tried to operate three to four weeks before that was done.

Q. But it was done in March, is that right?

A. I would say so.

Q. Approximately, before the end of March?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. But it was very early after the plant went into production, was it not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now you have stated again with regard to heat, that you considered 240 degrees Fahrenheit necessary, why do you say that?

A. That had been my experience in the way I had been taught on a hexane operation.

Q. Well, now we are talking about the Tri method. You know that?

A. That's right.

Q. Well, what effect would it have on the meal if you maintained a temperature of 240 degrees, what did you expect to gain by that?

A. I expect that we would have inactive urease.

Q. You have what?

A. I expected we would have inactive urease.

Q. Inactive urease?

A. Yes, sir, the urease would be negative in the meal.

Q. Is your statement in regard to heat connected in any way with the residual Tri?

A. Not necessarily. I would say it would be out there, that there would be no Tri in the meal.

Q. Did you say out there?

A. I meant out of there, and there would be no Tri in the meal.

Q. Could you say that a temperature of 240 degrees would remove all of the Tri from that meal?

A. I would say that it would; whether it actually does or not, I wouldn't say.

Q. Would you say that if it were slightly lower than that, say 225 degrees, that there would be residual Tri in the meal?

A. No, sir, I wouldn't say that.

Q. You wouldn't say that?

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know whether residual Tri in meal in any way is harmful to cattle?

A. I wouldn't know about that.

Q. You wouldn't know whether in the processing of this meal, it was important in the quality of that meal to have the Tri residual eliminated, if possible?

A. Yes, sir, I would say it was important to have it out of there.

Q. Why?

A. That it might be well on account of explosion purposes, or what I mean, heat purposes.

Q. Now the residual Tri in the meal, you mean?

A. Well, not from a danger standpoint that way.

but it would not be good to have it in the meal itself.

Q. Why not?

A. Well, I wouldn't know about that, except we just try to recover the Tri.

Q. I thought so. Now you made a statement that the meal should not be sold for cattle food?

A. That's right.

Q. Now on what do you base that opinion?

A. Well, I had heard there had been deaths of cattle from trichloroethylene meal being fed them.

Q. Due to what factor?

A. That I don't know.

Q. Was it because the meal had not been heated at 240 degrees?

A. No, sir, I wouldn't say.

Q. Was it due to the residual Tri in the meal?

A. I wouldn't say that either.

Q. So you don't know?

A. That's all I do know.

Q. That's correct, you don't know the reasons at all, do you, Mr. McDonald?

A. No, sir.

Q. I thought so. Now the burned beans were not used in any way in producing meal for sale for cattle feeding purposes, were they?

A. No, sir. Not to my knowledge.

Q. They were all gotten out of there, were they not?

A. They were used for fertilizer, as far as I know, it was all used for fertilizer, all the beans that were burned.

Q. All of these beans that were damaged or burned in this fire which you have spoken of, were used for the manufacture of fertilizer, is that correct?

A. As far as I know, it was, yes.

Q. When did you return to Greenville after you left there in September, Mr. McDonald?

A. In October.

Q. That was September of '51, I think that you left, about the 22nd of the month?

A. The 24th I believe is right.

Q. The 24th of September, 1951?

A. Yes, sir, I believe that is correct.

Q. Now when did you return?

A. I returned in November.

Q. In November of 1951?

A. That is right.

Q. So you were not present at the time of the explosion, the October explosion that you just referred to?

A. You mean at the November explosion, the third explosion?

Q. Well, now what was the date of that explosion? I thought it was in October.

A. I believe it was the first.

Q. I didn't hear what you said.

A. I said that was the first of November.

Q. What date?

A. I believe it was the first of November.

Q. And you returned on what date?

A. I returned on the next day after the explosion.

Q. So your testimony as to the cause of that explosion is entirely hearsay, is it not?

A. Well, it's from what I heard, yes.

Mr. Brooks:

If the Court please, we ask that that part of the witness' testimony be excluded on the ground that it is pure hearsay.

The Court:
Well, I don't recall that this witness gave us any cause for that third explosion. He merely said a certain piece of machinery there was split wide open. I don't think that he undertook to say what the cause was.

The Witness:
I didn't reiterate what it was.

(By Mr. Brooks):
Q. Now please correct me if I am wrong. Didn't you state it was due again to the use of a torch?
A. I did not.
Q. You didn't?
A. No, sir.

Mr. Brooks:
Then I withdraw the objection.

The Court:
Now this witness hasn't told us what caused that explosion.

(By Mr. Brooks):
Q. You were familiar with the manner in which Tri was shipped to Magnolia Soy Products Company, were you not?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. In what form was it shipped?
A. In drums.
Q. In drums?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Did you ever know of a drum to have a label upon it?

A. None other than the fact that it was trichloroethylene.

Q. None other than what?

A. That it was trichloroethylene.

Q. And that's all?

A. That's the only thing I ever saw in the way of a label on those drums.

Q. You never saw anything other than a label stating that it was Tri?

A. That's right.

Mr. Brooks:

That is all, sir.

Mr. Thomas:

We have no further questions, Your Honor. You may come down, Mr. McDonald.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. Thomas:

The plaintiff is through with this witness, and the defendant is through with him, I believe, and if Your Honor please, we will excuse the witness at this time.

The Court:

Very well. Whom will you use next?

Mr. Thomas:

If the Court please, the defendants call as their next witness, Mr. R. Stuart Armstrong.

R. STUART ARMSTRONG, a witness called by and on behalf of the defendants, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Direct Examination.

By Mr. Thomas:

Q. This is Mr. R. Stuart Armstrong?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I believe you spell your name S-t-u-a-r-t?

A. That's right.

Q. I believe you are generally known as "Stuart Armstrong"?

A. Yes, sir, that's correct.

Q. Where do you live, Mr. Armstrong?

A. In Wilmington, Delaware.

Q. With what firm or concern are you connected?

A. The E. I. Du Pont De Nemours Company.

Q. That oftentimes is called the Du Pont Company, or Du Pont?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is the same as the defendant in these cases, is that true?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And for how long a period of time have you been connected with the Du Pont Company?

A. Approximately seven and one half years.

Q. What colleges are you a graduate of, and what degrees do you have, Mr. Armstrong?

A. I'm a graduate of Purdue University.

Q. With what degree?

A. A B.S. in Chemical Engineering.

Q. And a B.S., of course, stands for Bachelor of Science?

A. Yes, sir, Bachelor of Science.

Q. In Chemical Engineering?

A. In Chemical Engineering, yes, sir.

Q. And what was the year of your graduation?

A. I graduated in 1941.

Q. Now after your graduation, with whom did you go to work?

A. The Gulf Research and Development Company.

Q. And you were with them how long?

A. Approximately eleven months.

Q. And who was your next employer?

A. I then went into the naval service, in the Naval Reserve on active duty.

Q. On active duty?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And how long did you serve in the Navy?

A. About four years.

Q. How were you separated, Mr. Armstrong?

A. I was separated in 1947.

Q. With what rank?

A. As Lieutenant.

Q. Now after your return from the Navy, with what company did you associate yourself?

A. At that time, I went with the United States Hoffman Machinery Corporation, Syracuse, New York, as Chemical Engineer.

Q. As Chemical Engineer?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And for how long did you work with them?

A. That was about two years.

Q. When did you first make your connection with the Du Pont Company?

A. In May of 1949.

Q. And you were stationed where?

A. First at Niagara Falls, New York, in the Chlorine Products Division Service Laboratory.

Q. Mr. Armstrong, are you familiar with the chemical compound known as trichloroethylene?

A. Yes, sir, I am.

Q. Is it sometimes spelled by leaving off the second "o"?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Leaving it trichlorethylene?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And is it commonly abbreviated as what?

A. As Tri.

Q. As Tri?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now how long were you in the laboratory in Niagara Falls, New York?

A. About six months.

Q. Then what department—You told us that was the Chlorine Products Division. Now what department were you in?

A. Well, that is the Electrochemical Department of Du Pont.

Q. And how long were you there at Niagara Falls, Mr. Armstrong?

A. About six months.

Q. And from there, where did you go, and in whose employ?

A. Well, I was transferred to the Electrochemicals Department in the Cincinnati District Office, Sales Office, as a Solvents Technical Representative for field work.

Q. And how long did you remain at Cincinnati?

A. I remained there about two years.

Q. Where did you go from Cincinnati?

A. From Cincinnati, I went to Wilmington, Delaware, where I am located now.

Q. You are in Wilmington, Delaware?

A. Yes, sir, that's where I reside now.

Q. Then you consider Wilmington, Delaware, your home?

A. That's right, sir.

Q. Have you been continuously located in Wilmington, Delaware, since you left Cincinnati?

A. Yes, sir, I have been in the Electrochemicals Department in Wilmington, Delaware, but I had different assignments with them in Wilmington.

Q. And what divisions of the Electrichemical Department were you assigned to at Wilmington, Delaware, Mr. Armstrong?

A. When I left Cincinnati, I was assigned to the Chlorine Products Division, in January of 1951.

Q. And what was your status or capacity that you were assigned at Wilmington?

A. Well, I was still a Solvents Technical Representative.

Q. Now that Solvents Technical Representative, now that is what you said your status was, is that right, sir?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is Wilmington, Delaware, the home office or general office of the Du Pont Company?

A. It is, yes, sir.

Q. Now how long did you remain in that position as Solvents Technical Representative?

A. I remained in that job until about August of 1953.

Q. Who was your superior from the time you went to Wilmington until the last date that you mentioned in 1953, who was your superior?

A. Mr. C. B. Shepherd.

Q. Was that Mr. Claude B. Shepherd?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what position did he occupy during all that time?

A. He is the Manager of the Chlorine Products Division of Electrochemicals Department.

Q. Do you know whether or not he has remained in that position even to this time?

A. Yes, he has, sir.

Q. All right, sir; now were you familiar, Mr. Armstrong, with a firm or corporation known as Magnolia Soy Products Company of Greenville, Mississippi?

A. Yes, sir, I was familiar with them.

Q. When did you first come in contact with Magnolia Soy Products Company, which I will refer to as Magnolia for short?

A. I first came in contact with them in about the middle of January of 1951.

Q. Of 1951?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And about how long was that after you had been transferred to Wilmington, Delaware, from Cincinnati?

A. Well, I was transferred there at the very first of January, January 1, and I imagine I reported on about the second, and so that would be at least two weeks after I had been at Wilmington.

Q. And what information, if any, did you have about a plant being constructed down at Greenville, Mississippi, by Magnolia, or by L. L. Ford Associates; did you have any awareness of that at all?

A. Well, I just knew there was one being constructed. I knew very little about it. I had been told about it by my predecessor, but I knew very little about it.

Q. Yes, sir; now prior to your first visit to Greenville to Magnolia, had you known either Mr. L. L. Ford or Mr. Lyman Reed?

A. No, sir. I didn't know either of them.

Q. What was the purpose of your first visit to Greenville, Mr. Armstrong?

A. Well, in line with my duties as a Solvents Technical Representative, we had been asked to visit Greenville to assist with the prospective use and handling of our solvent, trichloroethylene, and we went down for that purpose.

Q. And what was the purpose of your visit to Greenville at that time, was it, as you say, to look into this proposed plant?

A. Yes, sir, that's right.

Q. Now when you first came to Greenville then on that visit, about what per cent of the plant was completed, would you say?

A. Oh, it was 75 or 80 per cent completed, I would say.

Q. How did that visit and the purpose of your visit conform or square with the practice of Du Pont Company on procedures; was it usual or unusual to make such a visit?

A. It was usual. It was the common practice for the technical representative to make such a visit.

Q. Technical representatives with the Du Pont Company?

A. Yes, sir, I am speaking now for the Du Pont Company.

Q. With reference to what department?

A. Well, I first spoke of my own department, the Electro-Chemicals, but I know that it is common practice within the company as a whole, to offer technical service with the use or prospective use of their product, of their chemicals.

Q. Now after your first visit that you said was made in January of 1951, when was your next visit to Magnolia?

A. It was in February, I believe it was, when I arrived there, as I recall now on February 23, 1951.

Q. Tell us, please, sir, whether the plant was in operation at that time, or not?

A. It was not in operation the day I arrived, but they tried the initial operation, I believe, the second day, the first day after I had gotten there; they just started it up.

Q. When was your next visit to Magnolia?

A. Well, I stayed there until almost the beginning of March. Then I took a three day trip away from Greenville to make another service call, and I came back in early March, I think it was March 7 when I got back to Magnolia—That would be the third visit, you could say.

Q. Now after that visit, what communications, if any, did you have from any official or officials of Magnolia?

A. Well, on March 18, Mr. L. L. Ford telephoned me at my home. I remember it was on a week-end, and he told me they had had an explosion within the extractor unit of their solvent plant.

Q. Well, what occasioned that telephone call, why did he have to call you?

A. Well, he told me they had been burning on the base of the extractor with some sort of a torch or cutting torch, some sort of a burner, and at any rate, it was a high temperature torch.

Q. All right, sir; tell us please, sir, what information, if any, had you given Mr. Ford before that time as to the use of torches in there?

A. We had warned him verbally and also given him literature pointing out the possible hazards of

subjecting trichloroethylene under certain conditions to high temperatures. The specific piece of literature that we gave, that perhaps described this best, was the "Underwriters' Lab Card" which gave the physical or the combustion properties of trichloroethylene, and warned against subjecting it to high temperatures.

Q. Now what was the purpose of Mr. Ford's telephone call to you then?

A. Well, he said he was in need of some technical assistance concerning this incident, and he wanted me to come down and talk to him, and the other officers of Magnolia about it.

Q. Were you able to go at that very time?

A. Not right away. I had got an attack of the flu, as I recall it, but I went down about ten days later, when I had recovered. I did get down there.

Q. When you went down there, during any of your visits to Magnolia in 1951, Mr. Armstrong, what occasion, if any, did you have to notice any space heaters in the building?

A. Well, there was a space heater there from the very time of the starting of the plant, an open flame space heater, that I continually warned them about. It was in about eight feet of the extraction unit, and very likely the trichloroethylene vapors were in the area of the space heater.

Q. Do you recall what—

A. I was just going to add that I saw that space heater during all of the times I was there, and I told the representatives of the plant that the manner in which it was being operated was dangerous.

Q. And you stated that you talked to some of the officials of the plant; do you recall talking to Mr. Ford, Mr. I. L. Ford about it?

A. Well, he was the one I talked to mainly about it, although I also mentioned it to Mr. Lyman Reed. Mr. Ford was in the plant more than the others.

Q. What assurance did he make concerning this space heater after you asked him to get it out of there?

A. He was very noncommittal and evasive on it.

Q. Now you told us, after you had your attack of flu, that you came down to Greenville to the Magnolia plant again?

A. Yes, sir, I did. I visited there in late March.

Q. When was the occasion of that next visit, Mr. Armstrong, after your late March visit?

A. Well, the next time I visited Magnolia was in early May.

Q. And what was the occasion of this visit?

A. Well, I had, since my late March visit, at which time they repaired the plant and returned it to operation, and it had some difficulty in the solvent recovery, and they called to ask me to come down to assist in the solvent recovery processes, that was the purpose of the visit.

Q. Did you go then in May to visit the plant?

A. Yes, sir, I was there about three days in early May, working on it.

Q. Do you know Mr. Frank F. McDonald, the gentleman who left the witness stand a moment ago?

A. Yes, sir, I know Frank.

Q. Did you see Frank McDonald on the occasion of your visit to Magnolia plant in Greenville in 1951?

A. Yes, sir, he was there on each of the visits up to this time. I talked to him on each visit.

Q. Mr. Armstrong, what connection did you have concerning any research program that Du Pont might have had with the University of Minnesota,

concerning the hemorrhagic diseases of cattle from feeding tri extracted soybean meal?

A. I was one of Du Pont's representatives sent up to the University of Minnesota for the initial conferences, and on arriving there, we set up a research program that might determine the cause of this mysterious disease.

Q. And do you know whether plans were finally made and agreed upon when you made your first visit?

A. No, sir, they were not. There was some conflicting reports at that point. That was not until some time later that plans were finalized for the program.

Q. You say there were some conflicting reports as to what?

A. Oh, as to cattle diseases.

Q. Now what part, if you know, did Du Pont have in contributing to this University of Minnesota research plan or program?

A. Well, they contributed a lot of money to it.

Q. Do you recall any other concerns that, national concerns or otherwise, that likewise made contributions?

A. Yes, sir, I recall some other concerns, some big soybean processors like A. E. Staley Company, up in Decatur, Illinois. They contributed quite a large sum of money. Funk Brothers Seed Company, Bloomington, Illinois, Crown Iron Works Equipment Company, they made some small trichloroethylene extraction plants, and they contributed, and a couple of smaller soybean processing plants also contributed.

Q. What occasion did you have, Mr. Armstrong, to visit with the Food and Drug Administration of Washington, D. C., concerning this projected program at the University of Minnesota, and experiments being conducted there?

A. I went down there in June of 1951 to discuss this matter with them, that is, the hemorrhagic disease of cattle.

Q. And that was, you say, in June of 1951?

A. Yes, sir, it was the middle of June. I think it was June 14, actually, 1951.

Q. And what do you know of your own knowledge, whether it was after you talked with them, that the program was finally completed in July with the University of Minnesota, to give the experiments?

A. Yes, sir, it was after my visit to the Food and Drug Administration, because I recall asking the officials of the Food and Drug Administration what they thought of our, not our, but the program tentatively set up at the University of Minnesota. It had not been finalized at that point.

Q. Mr. Armstrong, there has been introduced in evidence in this case, a letter dated July 31, 1951, written by Mr. C. B. Shepherd, Manager of the Chlorine Products Division of Du Pont, addressed to Magnolia Soy Products Company, or to Mr. Lyman Reed, Sales Manager. That being exhibit P-35 in this case.

Are you familiar, Mr. Armstrong, with such a letter thus described by me a moment ago, regardless of what exhibit number or not, are you familiar with the letter dated July 31, 1951, written by Mr. Shepherd to Mr. Lyman Reed, Sales Manager of Magnolia?

A. Yes, sir, I am.

Q. Who wrote such a letter?

A. Mr. C. B. Shepherd.

Q. And is he the same man who was your superior in the Chlorine Products Division?

A. At that time, he was, yes, sir.

Q. I hand you this letter just referred to a moment ago, Mr. Armstrong, and ask you by whom that letter was delivered?

A. I delivered this letter in person myself.

Q. At whose request?

A. At Mr. Shepherd's request.

Q. And how did you deliver the letter?

A. I delivered it in person, right to Mr. Reed, and Mr. Ford was also present.

Q. When you say "Mr. Reed", and also Mr. Ford, you mean Mr. Lyman Reed and Mr. L. L. Ford, officials of Magnolia?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you delivered that letter to both of them?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you recall what date you delivered that letter?

A. I delivered that letter on August 3, 1952.

Q. And where did you come from in your delivery of that letter, what place?

A. I had just delivered a similar letter to the Thompson Soya Mill in Hiawatha, Kansas. I had just come from there.

Q. You say that was the Thompson Soya Mill?

A. Yes, sir, at Hiawatha, Kansas.

Q. What did you state with reference to a letter delivered to them, was that letter or not similar to the one that you have in your hand?

A. It was identical except for the address.

Q. And you say you had immediately come from Thompson Soya Mill at Hiawatha, Kansas, to Magnolia at Greenville?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now to whom else, sir, had you delivered, if anyone else, a similar letter before you came to Magnolia?

A. Before I came to Magnolia, I delivered a similar letter to the North Dakota Mill and Elevator Company up in Grand Forks, North Dakota, and to the Farmers Cooperative Elevator Association, of Blooming Prairie, Minnesota, and then to Thompson Soya Mill at Hiawatha, Kansas, and then this one here at Greenville to Magnolia Soy Products Company.

Q. And did you make other deliveries to anyone else after you left Magnolia?

A. Yes, sir, we delivered this letter to all known users of trichloroethylene for soybean extraction, that is, for the use of this solvent in the extraction of soybean meal, that is to say, soybean extraction, you understand.

Q. What instructions, if any, were given you by Mr. C. B. Shepherd, your superior, concerning the delivery of that letter, or any message connected therewith?

A. Mr. Shepherd told me to be sure that that letter was delivered to the persons to whom it was addressed, and that he paid attention to it. He told me to stress the importance of this letter, and he also told me to pass along whatever information we had at that time on hemorrhagic disease and the research program at the two schools that were working on it at that time, that is Iowa State College and the University of Minnesota.

Q. Yes, sir; now at the time you delivered the letter to Mr. Reed and Mr. Ford of Magnolia, do you know whether or not any definite factor had been isolated as one causing the death or injury to cattle?

A. No definite factor had been determined then, nor has any been determined today.

Q. Now when you delivered that letter to Mr. Reed and Mr. Ford, what was said by any and all of you at that time?

A. Well, at the time I delivered this letter, their plant was shut down, they were not using the solvent plant. They had no suitable beans. They had heard of these outbreaks in the North, and they were very much concerned over this letter, because as they stated to me, they were in bad financial shape, and they had planned to sell their plant, but with this letter, plus the recommendation in this letter, plus the information coming down from the North on those disease outbreaks, they didn't think their chances of selling the plant would be very good. They felt it would be difficult to sell it.

They also advised that in line with Mr. Shepherd's suggestions, that should they resume operations, they would investigate the possibility of selling this meal to swine and poultry raisers, to be used as feed for those animals, as outlined in the letter.

Q. Now tell us whether or not there was any instruction given you by Mr. Shepherd, other than the ones you told us about a moment ago, were those all the instructions given you by Mr. Shepherd?

A. Yes, yes, sir.

Q. Now Mr. Armstrong, there has been testified in this case through Mr. Ford, by his deposition that on the occasion of the delivery of this letter of July 31, 1951, that Mr Ford said that he told you "Here you have let us spend $500,000.00 building this mill, and now you tell us we can't use it to manufacture feed". Did Mr. Ford make such a statement to you?

A. No, no.

Q. Did he make any statement that might be reasonably interpreted to be the same or similar to that?

A. No, I don't recall it.

Q. And it has been further testified by Mr. Ford in that same deposition, that you then said, "The reason I brought it to you personally, was because I didn't want you to get excited about it". Did you make such a statement?

A. No, I didn't.

Q. Did you mak a statement that might be reasonably interpreted as being similar to it or equivalent to it?

A. No, I am sure I didn't. I wanted him to be concerned about that letter.

Q. Now, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Ford, in that same deposition, further testified that, "90 per cent of our business is cattle feed, and we can't sell a car a year other than for cattle feed, and now you tell us not to sell any more for cattle feed", and that you replied, "I didn't say that".

Q. Did you make that statement attributed to you by Mr. Ford, that "I didn't say that"?

A. No, sir.

Q. Or anyone that is equivalent to it or similar to it?

A. No, sir, I am sure I didn't.

Q. Did Mr. Ford make any statement as stated that "90 per cent of our business is cattle feed, and we can't sell a car a year other than for cattle feed, and now you tell us we can't do that"?

A. No, I don't recall any such statement.

Q. Or any statement similar to that, or which might be reasonably construed to be the same as the one I have just read?

A. No. They weren't operating at that time. They didn't think they would be.

Q. And why were they not operating, what was the trouble there?

A. Well, they had run out of beans, and their credit was bad, and they couldn't buy more beans at that time.

Q. And Mr. Ford, in his same deposition, has further said or testified that he asked you: "Does the Du Pont Company know we can't operate our mill, and have built one here that cost us $500,000.00, if we can't sell it for cattle feed, we can't operate it." Did he say that?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did he further say, "Does Du Pont tell us to shut it down, do they have any evidence", was that said by Mr. Ford on that occasion, Mr. Armstrong?

A. No.

Q. Or any other statement by Mr. Ford that might be construed to be the same or equivalent, and did Mr. Ford make any such statement?

A. No, he did not. They indicated that they were going to look into the possibility of selling it to the poultry and swine outlet.

Q. Now Mr. Ford further said in his deposition, that you then told him, "No, there isn't any evidence conclusive, there are rumors circulating from time to time". I'll ask you whether or not you made that statement or any wording similar to that statement?

A. I absolutely did not.

Q. Mr. Ford in the testimony of that deposition further has testified that he told you at that time that, "We couldn't operate unless we did sell it for cow feed", and that you, Mr. Armstrong, knew it was going to be used for that purpose, and that is with reference to the 23rd of November, 1951, sale.

Did Mr. Ford make that statement, or did you make that answer?

A. No, sir, not at all.

Q. Did you know or have any idea it was going to be used for cow feed?

A. I did not. I had no idea whatsoever that it was.

Q. And did Mr. Ford make the statement that you knew it was going to be sold for cattle feed?

A. No, not to me.

Q. And that he told you, "He couldn't sell it", or I will read his exact words, "I told Mr. Armstrong that we could not operate unless we did sell it for cow feed"; Mr. Armstrong, did Mr. Ford make that statement to you?

A. No.

Q. Or words that might be either said to be the same as that statement?

A. No, sir, I'm sure he didn't.

Q. Now on the occasion,—on this same occasion when the letter was delivered, Mr. Ford testified that you, Mr. Armstrong, expressed the opinion that so far as you knew there was not any evidence that trichloroethylene extracted meal had anything to do with the cattle losses, and I'll ask you did you make that statement?

A. No, we didn't,—I didn't. We did not detract from that letter of Mr. Shepherd.

Q. Now Mr. Armstrong, did Mr. Ford ask you this question: "I asked him point blank if Du Pont would recommend our closing the plant down because we couldn't sell it for cow feed", and it is said by him that you said, "They did not". Did Mr. Ford make that statement, and did you make that answer, Mr. Armstrong?

A. No, sir.

Q. Or words similar to that or equivalent to it?

A. No.

Q. Now Mr. Armstrong, at your visit to Greenville on August 3, 1951, to deliver the letter you referred to, did you have after that, or I'll put it this way, did you receive after that, any kind of communication by telephone call from Mr. Reed or Mr. Ford of Magnolia?

A. Yes, sir, on November 1, I received a telephone call from Mr. Lyman Reed.

Q. What was the purpose of that call, or what information was given you by Mr. Lyman Reed?

A. Mr. Reed informed me that they had just about forty minutes before that, had another explosion of their extractor and that a man had been gravely hurt, and actually the purpose of this call was to ask that we withhold shipment temporarily of a carload of solvent that he had ordered sometime before.

Q. Was that solvent trichloroethylene?

A. Yes, sir, it was trichloroethylene.

Q. Was there any further inquiries by Mr. Reed at that time?

A. No, he was shaken up at the time of the call, naturally, because of the explosion, as it was just a few minutes after it, and that's all there was to it.

Q. Do you know whether or not Magnolia got this shipment of trichloroethylene in that same month of November, 1951?

A. I don't have specific knowledge of how the orders of trichloroethylene were handled, but it is my understanding from the records, that they received it that month.

Q. What if anything was said by Mr. Reed in that phone conversation to you concerning whether he was

familiar with the resolution of the American Feed Control Official Association concerning Tri extracted soybean meal, that is used for cattle feeding; did he say anything about that?

A. No, he didn't talk about anything except the explosion in that conversation. We had a conversation later on, though.

Q. About how much later on?

A. Oh, he called me later in the month to ask where that solvent was, and I told him I would pass his request on to the commercial people, which was done, but after that matter was taken care of, I asked him if he was aware of the American Feed Control Official resolution.

Q. Concerning what?

A. Oh, concerning the labeling of trichloroethylene extracted soybean meal, prohibiting its use for cattle feed, and cows of any sort.

Q. What did Mr. Reed say to that?

A. He told me he was aware of it, that he had read it.

Q. And that was told you in that same month of November, '51?

A. Yes, sir, November 23rd, when he called me up about the solvent.

Q. Are you familiar, Mr. Armstrong, with the magazine or trade journal called "Feed Stuffs"?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I hand you a sheet entitled, "Feed Stuffs" and ask you what that is, please, sir?

A. That is a copy, it is a news item on the meeting of the American Feed Control Association, and the quotation of the resolution they made at that meeting on soybean extracted, or soybean meal extracted by the trichloroethylene solvent.

Q. Is that the same resolution that Mr. Ford said he was familiar with, about labeling it, and saying it could not be used for cattle feed?

A. That was Mr. Reed, not Mr. Ford, and that is the same man that I talked to.

Q. And that's the same resolution that Mr. Reed admitted that he was familiar with?

A. Yes, sir, that was the resolution that was the subject of our discussion at that time, yes, sir.

Mr. Thomas:

I would like to introduce that in evidence as defendants' Exhibit D-9.

The Court:

Very well, sir.

(The document above referred to was marked as Defendants' Exhibit D-9 for identification, and is received in evidence as an exhibit to the testimony of Mr. R. Stuart Armstrong.

The Court:

Gentlemen, it is now 12:00 o'clock, and Court will be in recess until 1:30.

You gentlemen of the jury bear in mind the same instructions that I have previously given you, and be back in your places at 1:30 o'clock this afternoon.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken at 12:03 p.m. until 1:30 o'clock p.m.)

(Title Omitted.)

Afternoon Session.

The Court:
All right, gentlemen, proceed with the examination of the witness.

Mr. Thomas:
Mr. Armstrong, will you take the stand, please.

R. STUART ARMSTRONG resumed the stand for further examination.

Direct Examination (Continued).

By Mr. Thomas:
Q. Mr. Armstrong, right before His Honor called the noon recess, you were asked about, and you told us, about the November 23 telephone conversation and the sheet of "Feed Stuffs" that has been introduced in evidence you recall that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now in this same conversation, what, if anything, did Mr. Reed have to ask about the progress being made on the University of Minnesota experiments?
A. He asked if there was anything new on the research work on the hemorrhagic diseases of cattle, if there had been any change.

Mr. Thomas:
That is all, Your Honor, on direct examination.

The Court:

Very well, gentlemen, you may cross examine.

Cross Examination.

By Mr. Brooks:

Q. Mr. Armstrong, on your first visit to the Magnolia plant in January, what did you see after you arrived there?

A. Well, of course, the first few moments were spent in the usual cordialities of meeting people, I am sure. We were accompanied by a Davidson-Kennedy representative also, and the group of us just discussed the prospective operations of the plant. I and the person who accompanied me from the Du Pont Company, F. G. Low, looked over the distillation solvent recovery end of the system, what equipment there was in place, it was not all connected up. The major components were there. It was more of an inspection visit than anything else, an acquaintance visit, you might say, getting acquainted.

Q. How many days did you remain on that visit at Magnolia?

A. We got down there, as I recall, about noon one day, we drove down from Memphis, and we left about the same time the next day.

Q. Did you go through the whole plant, through all of it, and view the equipment?

A. No, just the—We were primarily interested, you understand, in the solvent recovery part of it, that is, the distillation equipment, and the scrubbing equipment, that is, the solvent vapor scrubbing equipment.

Q. Did you make a number of suggestions, or any suggestions to Mr. Ford or Mr. Reed at that time, as to the efficiency of that plant and its operations?

A. It wasn't in operation.

Q. I said "and its operations".

A. It was not in operation, there wasn't anything in the way of efficiency in the operation we are talking about.

Q. Did you comment on the equipment?

A. Oh, I am sure we must have commented on the equipment. I don't recall any specific comments. It was so far from being completed.

Q. Did you recommend any additional equipment?

A. No, sir, I don't recall that we did.

Q. Now your next visit was in February, I believe?

A. Yes, sir, February 23.

Q. How long did you stay there at that time?

A. I stayed there from February 23, until about the 4th day of March, 1951.

Q. Tell us briefly what the purpose of that visit was what did you do while there?

A. Well, we had been asked to go down the help with the use and recovery of the solvent, and the safe handling of the solvent, trichloroethylene, during the initial starter. They had anticipated that that would be about the latter part of February. That would be their start-up date, and I made that visit to watch the performance of the trichloroethylene so far as its economical use was concerned and safe handling of it.

Q. Did you make any suggestions at that time as to additional equipment, or improvement in the equipment?

A. I believe I followed that visit up with a letter. I usually did. We did, as a matter of practice, on these service calls, you know, follow up any advice given on a visit as to the operation of the plant, and

so forth, or verbal suggestions, with written confirmation of the suggestions, so it is very likely I did follow that up and make some suggestions on the solvent recovery.

Q. You were acting in an advisory capacity, advising them, advising them with regard to the equipment and the operation of the plant, and so forth, were you not?

A. No, just on the handling and recovery of our solvent. This is a relatively expensive solvent, and to be competitive, we have to reclaim it, to re-use it, so the customer doesn't consume much of it, and that was my purpose in being there.

Q. You didn't discuss any of the other equipment, other than the recovery equipment?

A. What other equipment do you mean, Mr. Brooks? You mean the extractor?

Q. There is other equipment in addition to that just for the recovery of solvent, isn't there, Mr. Armstrong?

A. Oh, you mean the extractor, or the—

Q. Yes, the extractor.

A. And meal dryer.

Q. And for the toasting of the oil?

A. No, we had no special knowledge of that, and we didn't get into it except so far as the solvent recovery was concerned.

Q. And did you do the same when you were there in March?

A. In March? I visited there about March, 28, yes, sir. That visit was of the same nature.

Q. And then again you were there in May?

A. Yes, sir, I was requested to go down there in May to assist with solvent recovery. They were having trouble with it.

Q. During those five visits, you made no suggestions as to additional equipment, or improvement to the present equipment?

A. Well, as I said before, I may have made some suggestions along the lines of improving operation of our solvent recovery equipment in that plant, in those letters. I would have to see those letters to answer that question accurately.

Q. Before you went there in January, had you reviewed the files of the defendant concerning Magnolia?

A. Before I went to Magnolia in January?

Q. Yes, in January, had you reviewed the files in your office respecting the Magnolia Soy Products plant?

A. It would have been likely that I had, although I was accompanied by someone who was more intimately familiar with them than I was. I picked up more information after that call than before. I imagine it would be more likely that I reviewed them after the visit than before.

Q. Were you familiar with the sketches, charts, and drawings that had been sent by the defendant to, first, L. L. Ford and Lyman Reed, and the Davidson-Kennedy Company, and to Magnolia Soy Products plant?

A. I was not familiar with those sketches. I was aware that they had sketches of the plant.

Q. Had you ever gone over those files and reviewed those sketches prior to your May visit?

A. It is possible that I may, as far as this work I was doing, was concerned.

Q. You can't definitely recall?

A. I don't definitely recall that I did.

Q. You do know then what your predecessor recommended with regard to construction of that plant?

A. What?

Q. What your predecessor, T. J. Milligan, he was your predecessor, was he not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you recall his recommendations, what he sent to Magnolia?

A. I've seen them in the record, I have seen what he sent according to the records, yes.

Q. During the period of those five visits, when, Mr. Armstrong, did you learn about the sketches, you just said that you couldn't recall that you had been over them; now the question is—

A. Well, personally I don't recall that I ever had anything to do with the sketches, you see the plant was already erected there. I mean there wasn't a whole lot of it to be done, and there was no point in my going to the drawings and things of that sort.

Q. The plant was not completed when you made your first visit in January, was it, Mr. Armstrong?

A. That was an inspection visit. We spent very little time there.

Q. Now are we to understand you don't know what recommendations were made by Mr. Milligan, or do you know about the sketches and charts that he sent to L. L. Ford Associates, L. L. Ford, Lyman Reed, or the Davidson-Kennedy Company?

A. I think if you could show me what they were, I could tell you whether I had seen them before or not. I know Mr. Milligan, according to our records, sent them some advice on solvent recovery.

Q. But you can't say at this minute, from your knowledge, that you do know that you went over them?

A. No, I don't know which ones you are referring to, Mr. Brooks. I'm sorry, but if you can identify them, I can tell you, I am sure, whether I went over them or not.

Q. I am referring to the letter of T. J. Milligan, addressed to L. L. Ford, under date of August 11, 1950, with which he enclosed a number of charts, diagrams, and so forth, are you familiar with that letter?

A. Yes, I've seen a copy of that letter.

Q. And the enclosures?

A. I've seen the enclosures from time to time.

Q. Well, do you know what recommendations T. J. Milligan made with regard to fire hazards from trichloroethylene in a letter to L. L. Ford?

A. I don't recall anything specifically. If you can show me the letter, I'll tell you whether I recall it or not.

Q. Do you recall a letter signed by T. J. Milligan in which he stated that the fire hazard is principally confined to dust explosions, to explosions by dust?

A. I think that's quite true about a meal mill.

Q. Do you recall that he stated in a letter that a Tri plant could be built with much lower cost because of the low fire hazard?

A. I don't recall that specifically, but that is generally what is accepted as true.

Q. Well, is it not true that one of the big selling points of Tri as a solvent in the manufacture of soybean meal, is its non-inflamability?

A. It is relatively non-inflammable; it certainly is. yes, that was a selling point.

Q. And that was set out in many of your pamphlets, brochures and so forth; isn't that true?

A. Well, we gave the Underwriters Laboratory evaluation, I think, in each one of those pamphlets, in which the physical properties were discussed.

Q. And isn't it true, that in a schedule with either rated at one hundred, that Tri is rated at three?

A. That's correct.

Q. Now after the May visit, when were you next in Greenville at the Magnolia plant?

A. In August, August 3, when I delivered the letter.

Q. That was the time you delivered this letter to which you referred on your direct examination?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Subsequent to August 3, have you been in Greenville for the purpose of visiting the Magnolia plant, subsequent to August 3, now?

A. After August 3?

Q. Yes, after August 3, 1951.

A. Not in 1951, no. I think that was my last visit in '51. I made my next visit in 1952.

Q. On what date; do you recall?

A. Well, that was in February.

Q. What was the purpose of that visit?

A. Mr. Ford called me and requested that I come down and discuss the situation that they had encountered with hemorrhagic diseases of cattle, that was his request. Now when we got down here, I was accompanied by a gentleman from our agents in this area; he was very little interested, Mr. Ford was, I mean, in the hemorrhagic disease of cattle, but made a request for money from the Du Pont Company.

Q. Subsequent to August 3, 1951, what correspondence took place between the defendant, the Magnolia Soy Products Company, or any of its officers?

A. Subsequent to August 3, 1951?

Q. Yes, August 3, 1951.

A. I can only answer for myself. I don't recall writing any letter to Magnolia for the remainder of that year.

Q. Did you write any letters with regard to a shipment of Tri on November 19, 1951, or prior thereto, in connection with that order, or was that all handled by telephone?

A. No, sir, I didn't write any letters, to the best of my recollection.

Q. So subsequent to August 3, 1951, you wrote no letters?

A. No.

Q. You wrote no letters to Magnolia or to any of its officers?

A. I don't recall any. Now our commercial people would handle the trichloroethylene end of it.

Q. Well, now, as to the defendant in this case, did the defendant write any letters subsequent to that date?

A. I believe the—Well, I have no specific knowledge, I have no exact knowledge what other letters were written after that date. I can't answer that question.

Q. You can't say whether the defendant wrote any letters subsequent to August 3, 1951?

A. I can only speak for myself, while I am quite sure there must have been commercial letters of some sort written.

Q. You don't recall writing a letter to Mr. Ford under date of January 17, 1952?

A. In 1952?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would you say you wrote that letter?

A. That's to Mr. Reed, not Mr. Ford.
Q. Excuse me, it is Mr. Reed, yes, sir.
A. Oh, yes, I wrote that letter.

Mr. Brooks:
If the Court please, the plaintiff offers for identification, I think it's Number 66, a letter of R. Stuart Armstrong, dated January 17, 1952, addressed to Mr Lyman Reed, Magnolia Soy Products Company, Greenville, Mississippi.

The Court:
Very well, sir, let it be marked.

Mr. Brooks:
I beg your pardon, Your Honor. I was just told that was already in evidence. That was my error, sir.

The Court:
Very well, go on.

(By Mr. Brooks):
Q. Do you recall the purport of that letter, you have just seen it?
A. It was to acknowledge receipt of a copy of a letter forwarded by him.
Q. Was that a copy of a report of Doctor Chadwick, the State Veterinarian of Mississippi?
A. Yes, it was a copy of a letter by Doctor Chadwick to someone.
Q. Now did you go to Minnesota, in 1951, to the University of Minnesota?
A. Yes, I attended a meeting there.
Q. About what time?
A. That was in late May or early June.

Q. Will you tell us when you or the defendant in this case, first discussed the research work being carried on at the University of Minnesota, with regard to the feeding of soybean meal to cattle?

A. Well, that was, to the best of my knowledge, the first discussion, certainly the first organized discussion of this hemorrhagic disease, about that time, that was the latter part of May or early June.

Q. Had you had any communications or phone conversations with the University of Minnesota with regard to this research, prior to your going there?

A. No, sir, I don't recall that I did at all.

Q. How did you know about the research work?

A. Well, we, in company with these other concerns who were vitally interested in the problem, approached the University to get their interest in the problem.

Q. When did you first learn of it?

A. Learn of what, sir?

Q. Of the research being carried on by the University of Minnesota on this subject?

A. At that time when we started to get or gather up the program, the members of that conference started formulating a program for the research.

Q. That was the third week in May?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And when you went to the University of Minnesota, were told of any research at that time in progress?

A. I believe they had some rather informal experiments underway at that time, but nothing formal was started until we all agreed.

Q. Was there any mention made of work being done by Doctors Twehouse and Leasure?

A. No, sir, not at the University.

Q. At the time of your visit there?

A. No, sir, not to my recollection.

Q. Was there any discussion or mention whatever at that time concerning the deaths that had occurred, the outbreak that had occurred there in January of 1951?

A. The actual outbreak in Minnesota?

Q. Yes.

A. Oh, yes, that was the purpose of this meeting to determine what caused that, yes, sir.

Q. Did you learn at that time that 41 cows and calves had died by April 26, 1951, in Minnesota from the feeding of soybean meal, Tri processed soybean meal?

A. We didn't know at that time that it was Tri processed soybean meal. You see we had similar conflicting and confusing experiences before, and we just had to sort out these bits of evidence.

Q. Let me put it this way, Mr. Armstrong, did you learn that 41 calves and cows that had been fed Tri processed soybean meal had died in the Glencoe area during the year 1951, and that they had died by April 26, 1951?

A. I don't recall the specific area or the specific section, but I would say in general about that number in the Minnesota area.

Q. That was the Glencoe area?

A. I don't remember that.

Q. There is a Tri—or was there a Tri processing mill in Glencoe, Minnesota?

A. Yes, sir, the Farmers and Merchants Milling Company.

Q. And Du Pont did furnish or sell the Tri that was used by that plant, did it not?

A. We didn't sell to that plant directly.

Q. Well, did you sell to it through a broker?

A. We sold the trichloroethylene to a reseller in Minnesota, but I have no specific knowledge that he sold to that plant. At that time, I was not following sales of trichloroethylene, that is, personally.

Q. Did the defendant give the same technical advice to the Glencoe plant that it did to Magnolia, did you render the same service to that plant?

A. To the Glencoe plant?

Q. Yes.

A. Well, that processing plant was already pretty well established in that particular use of trichloroethylene in their Crown Iron Works equipment. I personally had never seen the Glencoe plant, and I have not seen it even to today.

Q. You testified on direct examination that the type of service that you gave to Magnolia and the type of service that Mr. Milligan gave before your going there in January, was quite usual.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that you say it was the same service that you gave other companies using your trichloroethylene, is that true?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Well, from that, are we to conclude that Glencoe got the same type of service?

A. We—Let me explain this. The Glencoe plant was manufactured and sold to them by the Crown Iron Works Equipment Company in Minneapolis, Minnesota. We gave essentially the same service to Crown Iron Works that we gave to Magnolia, but they then took own from there from their experience, and there was no need for us going further with them.

Q. Well, the defendant was familiar with the operation of that plant, was it not?

A. No, sir, we were not familiar with the operation of that plant. I have never been in that plant.

Q. Well, had the defendant had any other representative to visit that plant?

A. Not to the best of my knowledge.

Q. Now after you were at the University of Minnesota in May, didn't Du Pont Company receive any report, progress report on the experiment that was being conducted there?

A. That's out of my specific knowledge, Mr. Brooks. Our toxicologists were in direct contact with them.

Q. Mr. Armstrong, of your own knowledge, did the defendant in this case receive any report, progress report, after your visit to the University of Minnesota in May, regarding the experiment and research at that university?

A. I'm sure they must have, but I couldn't give you, say, as of a certain date, that we did receive one, but I'm sure we must have. They must have because we were helping support the research.

Q. Did you ever see any reports?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. When?

A. That's hard to answer.

Q. Can you answer it?

A. What was the question?

Q. The question was, and we were talking about progress reports, or any type of reports from the University of Minnesota, after your visit, was it in May, I believe you said, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Well, now the last question was, when you had seen any of those reports?

A. I am sure I must have seen some in Wilmington, but I am not sure when.

Q. Did you see any in June?
A. In June of 1951?
Q. In June of 1951.
A. No, sir.
Q. That was the month following your visit.
A. No, sir.
Q. Did you see any in July?
A. I saw—And this wasn't a report, however, no, I didn't see any report in July.
Q. Did you say that you knew of the experiment being conducted by Doctor Twehouse and Doctor Leasure with two calves in 1951?
A. Yes, I heard they had conducted an experiment.
Q. Do you know when that experiment started?
A. No, I don't recall the date; no, I don't know.
Q. Don't you know when the first calf died? You don't know that, sir?
A. No, sir.
Q. Don't you know that that calf died on July 9, 1951?
A. I read that in their report. I've read their report.
Q. When did you read that in their report, Mr. Armstrong?
A. I think that report came out in—It was issued in possibly late November, and we probably received it rather shortly thereafter.
Q. Didn't you or the defendant in this case receive any reports concerning the deaths that they had prior to the published report; now I'm talking about a report from the University of Minnesota to the defendant?
A. Which university is that?
Q. The University of Minnesota.
A. No, sir.

Q. You received nothing?

A. No, sir.

Q. You now say that you received no report?

A. I'm answering from my own knowledge. I'm not answering for everybody at Du Pont.

Q. Until you read in the published report of Doctors Twehouse and Leasure, that was issued around, well, in October, you knew nothing about it until that time?

A. That's correct.

Q. That is correct?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now you had a conversation on August 31, 1951, with Mr. Ford and Mr. Reed at the time you delivered the letter of Mr. Shepherd of July 31, 1951, did you not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Please state what Mr. Ford said during that conference?

A. I believe I stated that in my testimony this morning. In general, I stated what was said.

Q. Mr. Armstrong, I am asking you what Mr. Ford said to you. I'm going to ask you what you said to Mr. Ford. Now that is my question. What did Mr. Ford say to you on August 3, 1951, in the conversation held at the time you delivered the letter of July 31, 1951, signed by C. B. Shepherd?

A. Well, Mr. Ford expressed concern over the letter. He pointed out the plant was shut down, and they had little hope of resuming operations, because of their bad credit, they couldn't buy any more beans.

He had heard of the Minnesota outbreaks, and that, combined with the letter and the recommendations with the letter of Mr. Shepherd, in his letter which I had just delivered, made him feel it would be more difficult for them to sell their plant, but they

did not expect to resume operations; they were going to look into the possibility, however, of channeling their meal produced to swine and poultry outlets. Those are the only things that I can tell you of that conversation that he said to me.

Q. What did you say to Mr. Ford and Mr. Reed? Give us, if possible, your exact words.

A. Well, that's impossible to repeat my exact words.

Q. Well, give them as closely as possible, please, sir.

A. I gave them the information we had at that time on the disease outbreak up in Minnesota. I gave them the information that research work was just starting at the University of Minnesota, and that we were helping support it; that there was other research work started at Iowa State College to determine the facts in this case. Mr. Shepherd's letter was complete in itself, and it spoke well on the entire matter and covered the subject.

Q. We are talking about your conversation, please, sir, Mr. Armstrong.

A. Well, I expressed the importance of that letter, needless to say we were concerned about this situation, too.

Q. What did you say about the Minnesota experiment?

A. I told them that the—

Q. Now I'm asking you what you said about it.

A. I told them that "Experiments are in progress".

Q. That's all you said?

A. And I said, "We hope they will shed some light on the situation".

Q. You just told them that experiments were in progress?

A. Yes, sir, and that nothing definite had yet been determined.

Q. Nothing secific had been determined.

A. No.

Q. Did you tell them about the 41 calves and cows that had died up to April 26, '51?

A. I am sure they must have heard about that. They had heard about those outbreaks, you see.

Q. How do you know they had heard about them?

A. They told me so.

Q. They told you so?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. In that conversation?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Ford told you that he knew about the 41 cows and calves dying in Minnesota in 1951?

A. They knew that cattle and calves had died in Minnesota in 1951, yes.

Q. But they didn't know about that specific incident, did they?

A. What specific incident?

Q. The incident where those 41 cows and calves died in one area now, they just knew there had been some deaths of cattle in Minnesota, or that there had been an outbreak up there, isn't that right?

A. They knew there had been an outbreak up there, associated with the feeding of Tri extracted meal. I don't think that any number of cattle was mentioned.

Q. You, this morning, emphatically denied every statement made by Mr. Ford at the time he testified?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the Ladner case.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Very well. Was this question asked at the time you were testifying as a witness under oath in that case:

"At the time of the delivery of the letter, what knowledge did you have as to there being any definite factor isolated which was causing the deaths of cattle in association with Tri extracted soybean meal?"

A. Yes, it was asked me.

Q. When you delivered the letter to Mr. Reed and Mr. Ford of Magnolia Soy Products Company, Greenville, Mississippi, do you remember what was said by them at that time, was that question asked you, and did you answer it, "They were very much concerned over the letter, which seemed, due to the circumstances, they were in bad financially, or in a bad condition financially, and it was told to me that they wanted to sell the plant for $500,000.00. They had information on the cattle deaths in Minnesota in 1951, and that information, and the delivery of that letter made it impossible for them to get the price they wanted for that plant". Was that your answer, Mr. Armstrong?

A. I would say in general, it is.

Q. Were you asked this question:

"Can you tell us whether there was any other instructions given you by Mr. C. B. Shepherd with reference to the delivery of the letter, or anything pertaining to it?"

And was this your answer:

"I think that covers all of it to the best of my knowledge."

Was that your answer, Mr. Armstrong, as you recall it now?

A. Yes.

Q. Now the next question:

"To the best of your recollection, there was not any other instruction given you by Mr. Shepherd"?

And did you answer in this manner:

"Yes, to the best of my memory, I was told to deliver and stress the importance of the letter and be certain that it got into the hands of the proper person".

Now the next pertains to an entirely different subject. I want to ask you this, was that your answer?

A. May I ask you a question?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Was this from my testimony of this morning?

Q. No, no. This was the testimony you gave, as I just stated it, as a witness under oath in the trial of Ladner Vs. Du Pont. Was that your answer? I'll repeat it:

"Yes, to the best of my memory, I was told to deliver the letter and stress the importance of it, and be certain it got into the hands of the proper person".

A. Yes.

Q. Now that was your entire testimony on the subject of the conversation you had with Mr. Ford and Mr. Reed at the time you testified in the Ladner case, wasn't it?

A. The entire testimony?

Q. The entire testimony, yes.

A. I can't remember that transcript.

Q Well, here is the transcript. Look at it and see, sir.

A. Well, if there is anything further I said, I would remember it.

Q Well, just go ahead and look at it and see if you can find anything further that you said.

A. It might take a while to read it.

Q. Well, just go ahead and read it. Now I don't mean everything that is in that transcript. Go ahead and see if you said anything else about this conversation that you had with Mr. Ford at the time of the delivery of that letter.

A. That seems to be all.

Q. Then were the questions and answers correct, Mr. Armstrong, as I read them to you?

A. Yes, as you read them.

Q. Mr. Armstrong, at that time, Mr. Ford was in Greenville?

A. At which time?

Q. At the time of the trial of the Ladner case.

A. No, he was in Poplarville—

Q. Correction, my error.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. He was present at the trial of the case of Ladner Vs Du Pont at Poplarville, Mississippi, was he not?

A. He was a witness there, yes, sir.

Q. And he testified as a witness in that case, didn't he?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Ford is not in Greenville today, is he, Mr. Armstrong?

A. I don't know about that. I haven't seen him.

Q. Don't you know that Mr. Ford left several weeks ago for Iran?

A. By hearsay. I heard that. I couldn't know it.

Q. Now you also know that the testimony of Mr. Ford by deposition was admitted in evidence in this case, that is, the testimony of Mr. Ford in the Ladner Vs Du Pont case was admitted in evidence under stipulation of counsel in this case, do you know that, Mr. Armstrong?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Why did you not in the Ladner Vs. Du Pont case, deny the statements made by Mr. Ford when he testified as a witness in that case?

A. I didn't know what Mr. Ford testified to in that case until I read the transcript of the trial.

Q. Well, you didn't deny any statement he made, did you?

A. I didn't know what he stated in that case.

Q. Did you deny any statement that he made?

A. I didn't know what statements he made, as I couldn't deny them.

Q. Do you know whether you denied them or not, you know that, don't you?

A. I denied them here today.

Q. Did you deny them there at that time?

A. At that time, I didn't know what he said. I was out waiting in an outside room, like I have been here today. I don't know what Mr. Ford stated.

Q. You just read your testimony, have you not?

A. Yeah. I've read my testimony here about this conversation.

Q. Well, you just read it when I gave it to you a few moments ago, isn't that right?

A. Yes.

Q. And that testimony doesn't contain any denial on your part of any statement made by Mr. Ford, relative to that conversation at the time of the delivery of the letter of July 31, on August 3, 1951, does it?

A. You are asking me that one

Q. I'm asking you that now.

A. As of my knowledge today, I am sure I denied them.

Q. Well, according to that transcript, you didn't deny a statement made by Mr. Ford in the Ladner Vs. Du Pont case, of the conversations that were held with you on August 3, 1951?

A. If you will give me that transcript again, I'll look at it. I can't read it all at once.

Q. Very well, here it is.

A. Can you show me what Mr. Ford's testimony was to compare against this that you are asking me if I denied anything that he said; is that what you are asking?

Q. The question is very simple, Mr. Armstrong.

A. Not to me.

Q. I asked you if that testimony contained any denial by you of any statement made by Mr. Ford concerning that conversation at the time of the delivery of this letter on August 3?

A. This testimony that I have here?

Q. Yes, that testimony you have there. Do you see anywhere in it where you denied anything Mr. Ford has said?

A. No, I don't.

Q. Then there is no denial there?

A. No, not at that time.

Q. You did know that Magnolia Soy Products Company ordered additional Tri from Du Pont in October of '51, did you not, Mr. Armstrong?

A. Yes, I heard that, by my order clerk.

Q. Well, didn't you have a telephone conversation with Mr. Reed with regard to a shipment of Tri at that time?

A. Yes, he called me, well, he called me November 1, at the time of that explosion, to ask me to have the shipment delayed.

Q. So through that conversation, you did know that they had ordered additional Tri, didn't you?

A. I actually knew it shortly before that time, but I knew it at that time, yes.

Q. And as a result of that, you did postpone shipment until about the third week in November?

A. I put the machinery in motion to postpone it, yes, sir.

Q. After August 3, 1951, did you know or have any knowledge whatever from any source whatever that Magnolia was processing soybean meal for sale as cattle feed?

A. No, sir.

Q. For what period, how long, Mr. Armstrong, was it, when you first learned of it, after this time?

A. I first learned that they—Well, first—Now let's put it this way. The first occasion that I had to know that they had sold it for cattle feed was when Mr. Ford called us on January 8, 1952, and stated there was an outbreak in Poplarville, Mississippi.

Q. At that time, he told you of an outbreak in Poplarville, Mississippi?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. He told you that in that conversation?

A. Yes, sir, he said there were some deaths that he had just heard of, and he only had a little information on it.

Q. And from that conversation, you knew they had, after August 3, 1951, actually processed and sold the meal for cattle feed, and that cattle had consumed the meal, and that cattle had died at Poplarville, Mississippi, is that right?

A. I knew cattle had died at Poplarville, Mississippi, by his report

Q. The letter which you just identified contained a report of Doctor Chadwick, the State Veterinarian of Mississippi, or a copy of it to James Sinclair, County Agent of Pearl River County, Poplarville, Mississippi, and you acknowledged receipt of that report in the letter of January 17, did you not, Mr. Armstrong?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now doesn't that report contain these statements that 65 cows died—

Mr. Thomas:

If the Court please, we object to any reference by indirection purporting to come from someone else not present for cross examination or involved in this lawsuit. He is purporting to state from a letter written by Doctor Chadwick to James Sinclair, County Agent of Pearl River County, and that gentleman is not here for cross examination.

The Court:

Well, as I understand the gentleman, he merely asked the witness if he had that information.

Mr. Brooks:

That is correct, Your Honor. I asked him if he had knowledge by letter, and that letter is in evidence in this case. I asked him about receipt of that report, and his return of that report to Mr. Lyman Reed. I am asking if that report concerned certain things. Now I'm not asking whether they are true or not. I am merely asking if it contained certain facts.

The Court:

Well, I think that is competent under the circumstances. Go ahead.

(By Mr. Brooks):

Q. Does the report further state that Doctor Chadwick had directed that merchants having Magnolia Soybean meal, stop selling that meal?

A. Could I see that report? I can't remember.

Q. Yes, sir. Here is the report.

A. Would you repeat your last question, please?

Q. The last question?

A. Yes, sir, will you repeat it, please?

Q. Didn't Doctor Chadwick, in that letter, state that he had directed that Magnolia soybean meal not be sold subsequent to the date of that letter?

A. I don't see that in here. I want to point out right now, that I'm not a toxicologist. I'm a chemical engineer. When we get something like that, we just turn it over to our specialists, although I would have knowledge of its coming from one of my acquaintances in the field, I'm sure.

Looking over this, I would say, yes, sir, in that report, he has advised Mr. Thigpen that it was poison bean meal he was selling that was primarily the cause of the loss of cattle, and he was advised not to sell any more of that meal until further advice.

Q. Now from that report, you did know that subsequent to August 3, 1951, Magnolia had been processing meal by Tri extraction methods, and had sold that meal?

A. At that time?

Q. Yes, you certainly knew it when you read that report.

A. We could infer that was the case.

Q. Did you or the defendant send copies of any reports received at any time from Minnesota, from the University of Minnesota, on the work done there.

to Magnolia Soy Products Company, or any of its officers, copies of reports themselves, I'm talking about?

A. To Magnolia?

Q. Yes.

A. No.

Q. Now going back to the Colorado incident; did you ever discuss that incident with Mr. L. L. Ford or Mr. Lyman Reed or with anyone connected with the Magnolia Soy Products Company?

A. I didn't myself, but it had been pointed out to them.

Q. Was any report on that incident, any written report, or copy of any written report, ever sent to Mr. L. L. Ford or Mr. Lyman Reed, or Mr. J. M. Warren, President of Magnolia, other than the statement contained in the letter of T. J. Milligan?

A. Any kind of a written report on the Colorado cases?

Q. Yes.

A. On the Colorado outbreaks, you mean?

Q. Yes, the outbreak that occurred in 1949 and 1950.

A. Not to the best of my knowledge, I know of no report of that outbreak.

Q. Then you didn't discuss that, after you succeeded Mr. Milligan, I think you testified, were any officers of Magnolia ever told of that incident, and was it discussed?

A. I told you a few minutes ago, that in our discussions, the night of August 3, mention of that came up.

Q. Of the Colorado incident? You didn't say that before, to my recollection, Mr. Armstrong.

A. Well, maybe I mis-spoke myself.

Q. Now when the Tri was sent as a result of that November 1 phone call, what labels were on the drums?

A. I don't know.

Q. Did you ever see the drums shipped by your company?

A. Not after that date, no, sir.

Q. That is, to Magnolia, I'm speaking of.

A. No, sir.

Q. So you can't say whether they had labels or didn't have labels?

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know whether Tri is listed as a drug in the United States Pharmacopoeia?

A. No, sir, I don't know; I just don't know.

Q. You never made inquiry to ascertain that?

A. I don't recall making any inquiry. I wouldn't say I never did.

Q. After August 3, did you or anyone connected with the defendant in this case, make inquiry as to whether or not Magnolia was processing meal for sale for cattle feed?

A. No, sir, we never made any such inquiry.

Q. You never did make any inquiry into that?

A. No, sir, we had no reason to think that they were. We had given them our recommendations.

Q. I understand that; now did you ever suggest to them that the meal be labeled in any way?

A. I asked Mr. Reed if they were aware of the American Feed Control resolution.

Q. The question was—

A. And he was aware of it.

Q. Did you suggest that they put labels on the meal?

A. That resolution was a suggestion, and Mr. Reed was aware of it.

Q. Did the defendant make the suggestion that they put labels on it?

A. I guess that would be called an indirect suggestion.

Q. Did the defendant make any suggestion in writing or by telephone after August 3, or at any time, that Magnolia put a label that the meal should not be fed to cattle, on the bags of soybean meal they sold?

A. We made no suggestions like that, no, sir, other than my phone conversation, which I have already related.

Q. You never did that at any time?

A. You mean in the phone conversation?

Q. You don't recall making any such suggestion, do you, Mr. Armstrong, telephone calls on that point, you don't remember ever making that statement, do you?

A. Yes, we discussed, or we mentioned that American Feed Control resolution, and the "Feed Stuffs" article, and Mr. Reed had seen it.

Q. Yet you did, in a telephone conversation you mentioned on November 23, you asked if he had seen that resolution?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Armstrong, I think you testified that you asked if he had seen the resolution prohibiting the sale of soybean meal, tri processed soybean meal, for cow feed?

A. I used the word prohibited in connection with the laboratory report.

Q. Now I hand you Defendant's Exhibit marked D-9, and in that second paragraph is the resolution. Would you please read that to the Court and Jury.

A. You want me to read this thing?

Q. Just read the resolution, please.

A. (Reads.) The resolution is as follows: "Be it resolved that this association goes on record as discouraging the use of Tri solvent extracted soybean oil, oil meal, flakes or pellets, in rations for calves, dairy and beef cattle, until it had been proven that these products are non-toxic to such animals, that when these products are sold or offered for sale, the processor or manufacturer shall place a warning stamp prohibiting their use, and it shall be stated on the label."

Q. The word "prohibit" is not in there, Mr. Armstrong.

A. The word "prohibit"? Well, I just read it that way.

Q. It is a mere recommendation, the way you used the word in there, isn't it?

A. No, sir, I stated the word "prohibiting" on the label. I did that probably because I am so familiar with it.

Q. What does the label say?

A. It just makes a recommendation.

Q. So that is just a recommendation?

A. It is a recommendation resolution.

Q. The resolution contains a recommendation as to the type of label that the manufacturer is to use, is that correct?

A. I don't see the word "recommendation" used in there.

Q. Well, let me see what it does say.

The word is "discourage", is it not?

A. Yes, sir, "discourage" is the word used, but the label prohibits the use, and it's in there very strongly, the whole feed trade was acquainted with that article in there.

Q. Now they didn't say that it would be prohibited, did they?

A. Well, on the label it says it is prohibited.

Q. Well, they recommended that the meal not be sold, discouraging the sale of meal until such a label was put on the meal, did they not?

A. Which prohibited its use.

Mr. Brooks:

That is all, Mr. Armstrong, that we have to ask you.

The Court:

Is there anything further from this witness?

Mr. Thomas:

No, sir.

Come down, Mr. Armstrong.

(Witness excused.)

* * * * * * * *

C. B. SHEPHERD, a witness called by and on behalf of the defendants, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Direct Examination.

By Mr. Thomas:

Q. You are Mr. C. B. Shepherd?

A. That's right.

Q. And you sign your letters C. B. Shepherd, too, do you not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Shepherd, where do you live?

A. Wilmington, Delaware.

Q. For how long a period of time have you been connected with E. I. Du Pont De Nemours Company?

A. 27 years.

Q. Has that been continuous service, Mr. Shepherd?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How old are you, sir?

A. 48.

Q. What college or colleges are you a graduate of, Mr. Shepherd?

A. Drexel Institute of Technology.

Q. Where is that located, sir?

A. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Q. What degree did you receive there?

A. I received a B. S. degree in Chemical Engineering.

Q. In what year?

A. 1928.

Q. On graduation, what was your first employment?

A. I was employed immediately by Du Pont as a chemical engineer in Wilmington, Delaware.

Q. You went from college to work for du Pont as a chemical engineer?

A. That's right.

Q. And you have remained with them continuously since that date?

A. No, I was transferred to the Engineering Department, still in Wilmington, however, after about four years, and in 1939, I was transferred to Niagara Falls to the Electrochemical Department.

Q. In what capacity?

A. As Solvents Sales Department Engineer.

Q. But you have continually been in the Solvents Department at Niagara, was that right?

A. No, just about two years before the war broke out, I was transferred to the Chemical War Department plant.

Q. How long were you there?

A. About a year.

Q. In that plant, or at Niagara Falls?

A. In that plant.

Q. Were you in the same plant at Niagara Falls?

A. No, sir, then I was transferred back to the Niagara plant of the Electrochemicals Department as Assistant to the Plant Manager, and shortly after that as Assistant Manager of the Assembly Works Group.

Q. Well, now what is that group?

A. That was a group that was engaged in the development work on war problems.

Q. From Niagara plant, where did you go?

A. In 1945, I was transferred to the Sales Department.

Q. Have you been in that department until now with Du Pont?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what capacity are you at Wilmington?

A. I'm in the Sales Department, Manager of the Solvents Division.

Q. That's the same division—in other words, how does your capacity now correspond with what it was then?

A. I was promoted to Manager a couple of years later, of the Solvents Division. It means a little more than the position I had in the job preceding that, and I am now Manager of the Chlorine Products Division, which is, I think, an improved status.

Q. How long have you been Manager of the Chlorine Products Division, Mr. Shepherd?

A. Eight years.

Q. Eight years?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr Shepherd, do you know R. Stuart Armstrong, who just left the witness stand a short while ago today?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the year of 1951, under whose supervision was he?

A. Mine.

Q. What was his capacity, or what did he do, please, sir, under your supervision?

A. He was Solvents Technical Representative.

Q. Do you recall what time he made his first connection in your department and under your supervision?

A. It was in 1951, in January.

Q. When he first came to your division in January of 1951, and through the remainder of 1951, and on into 1952, he was Technical Solvents Representative in your division, is that right?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what were the duties of Mr. R. Stuart Armstrong as Technical Representative, Solvents Technical Representative in your division, is that right?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what were the duties of Mr. R. Stuart Armstrong as Technical Representative, Solvents Technical Representative?

A. His duties were to assist customers or prospective customers in the economical use of our products.

Q. How did these services that were rendered by him compare or relate to Du Pont generally, that is, to Du Pont's services generally?

A. Du Pont does that in most every department. In fact they do it in all departments.

Q. How does that type of service rendered by Du Pont, rendered by it compare to that service rendered rendered in general by the chemical industry?

A. That is comparable to any rendered by the chemical industry in general.

Q. Do you so know some of the large national concerns that follow identical practice?

A. They all do, as far as I know, but to my knowledge, I know that Niagara Alkali, Looker, Detrex Corporation, all good competitors of ours, do the same thing, and the Shell Chemical Company, and the Doe Chemical Company, and American Cyanamide.

Q. Now what is meant, Mr. Shepherd, by the term "Technical Sales Service"; what is meant by those words?

A. We define that as covering two categories of technical service to customers.

In one category, we offer and give technical assistance to equipment manufacturers or companies who are starting a new process, either extending their equipment, or on their initial start-up of equipment, which uses our solvent. We give them as much assistance as we can in solvent recovery, and in that portion of that process.

Q. All right, sir, now in the other category, what do you do?

A. In the other category, we give service to what you might call our regular customers who are using established processes, but that type does not require

much time on the part of our men, we've had some several thousand customers using our solvent, and that means that we have to have adequate manpower to give that service satisfactorily, which we try to do.

Q. Does Du Pont render the same service in other fields, with respect to those who use Tri?

A. Yes, we render different degrees of service to those using our solvent.

Q. How long do you stay with a customer, Mr. Shepherd?

A. Well, in the early development, we work two or three weeks with them on the equipment. We spend full time work with them on design of equipment and teaching them as to the use of the solvent, and stay until we feel that they would be sufficiently informed to where they could carry on the operation, and until they would be competitive. Now also on the equipment companies, that manufacture equipment which will be put to use handling our solvent, using it for extracting various products, we stay with those people and give them every direct help that we can toward the using of the technical company's equipment, and we give those technical companies who manufacture the equipment, everything that we know about it, and when we leave, why, the companies require no further service.

Q. Has Du Pont rendered service to others in the use of Tri?

A. Yes, sir, to several companies. Crown Iron Works is one.

Q. Where is that company located?

A. Minneapolis, Minnesota. We detailed, or I detailed a man to spend his full time with them in their solvent recovery system, and that same person spent quite a bit of time assisting them to start up their first unit.

Q. What occasion, if any, do customers have to request such services from Du Pont, as you have just described in the use of Tri as a solvent, Mr. Shepherd?

A. Why, we get requests of that kind all the time, many times, and we have probably spent thousands of dollars of information, engineering, chemical information, and information on physical properties of our solvent that no individual company interested in the use could possibly obtain for themselves, so naturally they call on us for that information.

Q. Mr. Shepherd, with particular reference to Magnolia Soy Products Company, how would you classify that service?

A. With Magnolia Soy Products Company, I would say that I would classify that under both categories, and they received the technical assistance from us in the design of their solvent recovery equipment, later in the initial operation of that equipment.

Q. What is meant by a solvent?

A. I'd say in simple terms that a solvent is a liquid capable of or used for dissolving other liquids or solids.

Q. What is meant by solvent recovery? What do you mean by that term?

A. We use that term to mean the recovery of our product, our solvent, in a process so that it can be reused, over and over again, in the processes with minimum loss.

Q. Mr. Shepherd, what are the advantages of Tri, if any, over other solvents?

A. The major advantage is the relative non-inflammability, thereby reducing the fire hazards which lowers insurance rates, and it requires less expensive plant equipment.

Q. Now of your own knowledge, do you know whether or not Mr. R. Stuart Armstrong had contact with Magnolia at Greenville, Mississippi?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. To whom, if anyone, were his reports made concerning visits to Magnolia?

A. Me.

Q. And you are Manager of the Chlorine Products Division, and were at that time?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When were you first aware of the relationship between hemorrhagic diseases in cattle the and feeding of Tri processed soybean meal?

A. I first became aware of that in 1939, shortly after I moved to Niagara Falls. The chemical group there had studied reports from Stockman and some German authorities on hemorrhagic diseases in Scotland, in Germany and in the Low countries, and they concluded that those reports were contradictory and inconclusive.

Q. Did the Du Pont Company conduct or finance any experiments to determi the relationship of this feed by Tri extracted soy bean meal to hemorrhagic disease of cattle in this country?

A. Yes, sir. Attempting to determine whether Tri extracted soy bean meal had any connection to hemorrhagic disease in cattle or had any effect on cattle, we initiated tests at Cornell University under the direction of Professor Maynard.

Q. Is that spelled M-a-y-n-a-r-d?

A. That is right. He was a well known nutritionist and he worked in close collaboration with our Doctor Vollotson of the Electro-chemical Department.

Q. All right, sir. Doctor B. H. Vollotson of the Electro-Chemical Department?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know now long these experiments extended?

A. From 1937 to 1939.

Q. I believe that that report has been here in this case, has it not? You don't know whether it is in evidence, but there is such a report?

A. That report was issued sometime in 1941 by Vollotson. It was prepared in collaboration with Maynard.

Q. With Professor Maynard?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did Du Pont do after the Cornell University experiments were completed?

A. Nothing; we were just entering World War II about that time and all of our technical personnel and efforts were completely assigned to the war effort, and we did nothing at all on this soy bean extraction. Several other companies moved up on it though and installed plants during the war, and at the end of the war four more plants were operating and producing meal.

Q. Do you know some of those concerns that had got in there?

A. Yes; the Farm Cooperative Bureau at Springfield, Thompson at Hiawatha, Roach at Plainfield and there was one in Indiana, Indiana Farm Bureau Cooperative, I believe.

Q. Now when did Du Pont become interested again in the use of Tri as an extraction agent for soy beans?

A. In 1947 after several equipment companies approached us and said they were very much interested in designing equipment for the extraction with Trichloroethylene for soy beans, cotton seed, and asked us for technical assistance and engineering data on our products.

Q. What awareness, if any, did you have there in the year 1950 as to hemorrhagic disease of cattle being associated with tri extracted soy bean meal, in the year 1950?

A. Sometime in the early Spring of 1950 we had reports from Iowa and Colorado that there had been some deaths of cattle that might possibly be associated or connected with Tri-chloroethylene extracted meal. These were the first reports we ever received in this connection. Actually by that time some sixty million pounds of mean had been sold with no bad results, no complaints.

Q. Tri extracted soy bean meal?

A. Yes, sir; processed and sold with no complaints at all.

Q. And that was the first report in this country of there being any association with the hemorrhagic disease and tri extracted soy bean meal?

A. That's right, in the Spring of 1951 to our knowledge.

Q. What decision or what efforts, if any, did Du Pont make concerning these reported outbreaks in Colorado and Iowa or either?

A. I sent two men immediately to investigate these reports, and the first went to Iowa, and from there to Colorado where most of the cows were killed. Some died, some 150 cows and they found that only 20 of the 150 had ever used the Trichloroethylene extracted soy bean meal, but the others, based on every bit of information we could obtain through the processors, through the farmers, or the state veterinarian, had never used Trichloroethylene extracted soy bean meal, but had been on either hexane extracted or expeller meal. Now that looked like a solution of the Trichloroethylene in that case and the possibility of

trichloroethylene being a factor at all was completely rejected by the State Veterinarian there.

Q. Of Colorado?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was the firm or partnership of L. L. Ford Associates notified or advised of this outbreak in Colorado and Iowa and the investigation made?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. They were notified of those outbreaks and the investigation of those things you have just testified about?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What occurred in the year 1951 or the next year, concerning hemorrhagic disease in connection with or association with Tri extracted soy bean meal, to your knowledge?

A. We had no further complaints of any type until the Spring of 1951, when we had a report of deaths in Minnesota, which against might possibly be attributed to the feeding of Trichloroethylene extracted soy bean meal, and again we investigated those deaths. This time I sent a man out who contacted the University of Minnesota and the National Soy Bean Association—Soybean Processing Association, and they got together a team which investigated the deaths in the field, and they did establish, after considerable time, following through with the individual farmers, that Trichloroethylene extracted meal had apparently been fed in every case to those cattle. That was the first time that had been apparent.

Q. Now that was when a program was agreed upon with the University of Minnesota in connection with working on the program or experiment to determine the death factor, if they could?

Q. After that information had been developed, we, in cooperation with the University of Minnesota and others interested, worked out a program for research to determine if tri extracted meal was in fact associated with these deaths in Minnesota.

Q. Did Du Pont make any monetary contribution to this program at the University of Minnesota?

A. Yes, sir; we made the major contributions.

Q. And were other concerns, feed concerns, or equipment manufacturers likewise interested and made contributions?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Could you name some of those, just one or two?

A. Yes; A. Staley Company, Funk Brothers, and several of the mills in Minnesota using the trichloroethylene process, and the Crown Iron Works who made and sold the trichloroethylene processing equipment to those mills.

Q. Do you recall about when it was that the contract for the program, the research program, was made, when it was finalized, or became final, or agreed upon by the parties, do you remember what month or what time it was?

A. It was in the latter part of July.

Q. Of what year?

A. 1951.

Q. What awareness did the United States Food and Drug Administration in Washington, D. C., have in connection with the program agreed upon with the University of Minnesota?

A. I sent Mr. Armstrong down to Washington to [illegible] Food and Drug Administration in June to acquaint them with the developments in Minnesota, and our conversations with the University of Minne-

sota and the National Soybean Processing Association, and we discussed in some detail the proposed research program to be carried out by the University of Minnesota, and we went ahead on that program shortly thereafter, after they had given their full approval.

Q. Mr. Shepherd, are you familiar with what is known as the American Feed Control Officials Association?

A. Not directly. I know of them.

Q. You have heard of them?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know of your own knowledge of any steps taken by that association regarding Tri extracted soybean meal, or the hemorrhagic disease of cattle in 1951?

A. Yes, sir, they issued a resolution sometime in the fall, stating that meal should be labeled with a label, indicating it was Tri extracted meal, and the label should indicate its use for cattle feeding should be prohibited.

Q. Do you recall whether that was done before or after July 31, of 1951?

A. That was after that date. It was in the fall.

Q. In the fall of 1951?

A. Yes, in October of 1951, I think.

Mr. Brooks:

When did you say; what was that date, Mr. Shepherd?

A. In October of '51, I believe, Mr. Brooks.

(By Mr. Thomas):

Q. After the program of the University of Minnesota was agreed upon, what occasion, if any, did you

have to write a letter to Magnolia Soy Products Company?

A. I wrote a letter to Magnolia Soy Products Company on July 31, 1951, pointing out that there had been some deaths in scattered areas which were associated with the feeding of Tri extracted soybean meal, that while all evidence was entirely circumstantial, it had been shown that Tri meal had been used, and we strongly recommended that the sale of this Tri soybean meal should be channeled into other fields such as swine and poultry fields.

Mr. Brooks:

If the Court please, when he said that they strongly recommended, are you referring to the wording in that letter now, your letter of July 31? If you are not, I'm going to object. The letter stands for itself.

The Court:

All right, gentlemen; that's true. Let's let him read the letter. What he said is in it. Let him read it.

Mr. Thomas:

What he said—

The Court:

No matter what he said, let him read the letter.

(By Mr. Thomas):

Q. Mr. Shepherd, I hand you what purports to be a letter on the letter head of Du Pont and ask whether or not you have ever seen that before?

A. Yes, sir; I have.

Q. Who wrote and signed that letter, Mr. Shepherd?

A. I did. I believe it is directed to Mr. Lyman Reed, Sales Manager.

Q. When is it dated?

A. July 31, 1951.

Mr. Thomas:

If the Court please, we would like also to have this made an exhibit to our testimony, Judge, I know it is in the record.

The Court:

All right, sir; let it go in. It is already in. Mr. Thomas I think it would be more satisfactory to let him go ahead and read the letter.

Mr. Thomas:

Very well, sir; we will do that, Your Honor.

The Court:

Yes, sir, the letter should be read.

(By Mr. Thomas):

Q. O. K., Mr. Shepherd, would you read the letter which has been marked as Exhibit 10 to this cause?

A. Yes, sir.

(Reads the following letter.)

This is on the letterhead of E. I. Du Pont De Nemours and Company. It is dated July 31, 1951.

"Mr. Lyman Reed, Sales Manager
Magnolia Soy Products Company
Greenville, Mississippi

Dear Mr. Reed:

In recent months, there have been increasing indications that trichloroethylene-extracted soybean meal

may be associated with a hemorrhagic disease in cattle which has been observed in widely-scattered areas. Research programs are now being undertaken by the University of Minnesota and Iowa State College to investigate the nature and cause of the disease and to determine if trichloroethylene-extracted meal is, in fact, a contributory factor.

The cause of the disease is unknown. The evidence that trichloroethylene-extracted meal is associated in any way with the disease is entirely circumstantial, but the most recent reports have all come from farms using this type of meal in their cattle feed. Thus, despite the satisfactory experience with trichloroethylene-extracted meal in the past, we cannot ignore the possibility that this meal under certain conditions, perhaps in combination with one or more other factors, may be associated with the particular hemorrhagic disease observed in Minnesota and other scattered points.

In view of the present uncertainty, we strongly recommend that sales of trichloroethylene-extracted meal be confined to outlets other than cattle feed until more definite information is available from the investigations now underway in Minnesota and Iowa. To the best of our knowledge, the hemorrhagic disease in question is peculiar to cattle only, and all the available evidence and experience indicates that trichloroethylene-extracted meal is entirely satisfactory as a component for feeding hogs and poultry.

Yours very truly,

C. B. SHEPHERD,

Manager Chlorine Products Division."

Q. That letter is signed by you?

A. Yes.

Q. By whom was that letter to be delivered to Magnolia?

A. By Mr. Stuart Armstrong.

Q. And to whom was that open letter to be delivered under your supervision in this country of like tenor, what other letters?

A. Well, we sent similar letters to all known processors of soybean meal, using Tri as a solvent.

Q. Who gave instructions to Mr. Armstrong to deliver the letter to Magnolia?

A. I did.

Q. And what was that instruction?

A. I told Mr. Armstrong to deliver the letter personally, to see that it was delivered to the person to whom addressed, or a responsible officer of the corporation, or in his absence, to make sure the information of that letter was stressed, and understood, and to arrange and answer any questions that might have been asked regarding the research work that was underway in Minnesota.

Q. Mr. Shepherd, how long have you been familiar with the chemical compound called Tri?

A. Since 1939.

Q. State what uses this compound has and did have in 1951?

A. Well, it has a large number of uses, the most important one is used in the metal—

Mr. Brooks:

Just a minute. If the Court please, I think that in going into the many uses of Tri, he is getting completely outside the field at issue in this case, and we object to it.

Mr. Thomas:

We take the position, if Your Honor please, that we should be allowed to show that Du Pont was active in promoting the sales of Tri all over the country, and that it was being used as a solvent, and we think it would be entirely competent.

The Court:

Well, I think it is all right to go into the general situation, but now don't get into a lot of details as to how many uses, why one of the other witnesses has already testified and I am sure correctly, that it had many uses. Now if you want to mention some of the uses, one or two, as have already been put in the record, why you may do that, but we don't have time to have every witness come up here and tell us what it is used for, tell us the same thing. I remember what he said.

Mr. Thomas:

I mean to be very short on this, Your Honor.

(By Mr. Thomas):

Q. Go ahead, sir.

A. Well, it is used in metal cleaning, dry cleaning, cleaning wool piece goods, and many other extraction processes, including de-caffeination of coffee.

Getting into another field, it is also used as an anesthetic for childbirth and for dental operations. There is an increasing use of it in that field.

Q. How long has Du Pont been manufacturing Tri, Mr. Shepherd?

A. Since 1930.

Q. Now this is only percentagewise, but I would like to ask what percentage of sales in 1951 came

from the sale of Tri solvent extraction of oil meal or oil from soybeans, as compared to the total sale of Tri?

A. As far as Du Pont's sale was concerned, it was well under one per cent. It was actually under one-half of one percent of our total sales.

Q. What other companies other than Du Pont in the year 1951 were engaged in the manufacture and sale of Tri?

A. The Detrex Corporation had two plants, the Dow Chemical Company and Niagara Alkali Company.

Q. Mr. Shepherd, are you familiar with the records of Du Pont Company, with regard to receipt of an order from customers and the billing out of the invoice on receipt of confirmation therefor?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are records customarily made by the company in each and every instance, as to every order and every invoice?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I now hand you a sheaf of papers, and ask you were they received, please, sir.

A. Let me look at them, please.

Q. I hadn't finished, Mr. Shepherd. This is a duplicate copy of the entry of the order received. This is not the—

A. That is correct. This is a duplicate copy, and it was made from the original entry.

Q. And it concerns what company?

A. This order concerns the Magnolia Soy Products Company.

Q. Is that taken from the company's files?

A. This is from our files, yes, sir.

Q. Is that the original or a carbon copy retained in the company files?

A. That's a carbon copy.

Q. What is the blue sheet attached to that, Mr. Shepherd?

A. That is a copy of the shipping invoice sent from the factory.

Q. Where was the factory located that shipped out the Tri down to Magnolia?

A. It was located at Niagara Falls, New York.

Q. In what state was the order for that shipment made that came down to Magnolia, of Tri in November of 1951; in what state was that order accepted and confirmed in?

A. That order was accepted and entered in New York City, New York, and confirmed from that same office, that is, acknowledgment was made of it from the same location.

Mr. Thomas:

If Your Honor please, we would like to introduce in evidence, this white sheet and the blue sheet just testified to by Mr. Shepherd, as Defendants' Exhibits 11 and 12, and ask that they be marked for identification and received.

The Court:

Very well, sir.

(The documents above referred to were marked as defendants' Exhibits D-11 and D-12 to the testimony of the witness Shepherd for identification, and are received in evidence.)

(Mr. Thomas):

Q. Now Mr. Shepherd, I hand you a third sheet and ask you what this is, please, sir?

A. This is an exact copy of the acknowledgement of the order which was sent to Magnolia Soy Products Company.

Q. In connection with this same order referred to in the last previous exhibit?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. It is an exact copy on the front and the back of that sent to Magnolia Soy Products Company?

A. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thomas:

I believe that is all on direct examination.

The Court:

The witness is with you for cross examination, gentlemen.

Cross Examination.

By Mr. Brooks:

Q. Mr. Shepherd, how many companies were there in the United States using Tri for the processing soybean meal for feed for cattle in 1951?

A. I would say 8 companies, to the best of my knowledge, at some time or other during that year.

Q. Were all of those companies purchasing Tri from Du Pont?

A. We sold all of those companies at one time or another. I couldn't say whether they were purchasing their full requirements from us or not.

Q. Well, let's say on April 1, 1951.

A. I can't tell you that. They may have purchased some part from another supplier. We have no way of knowing that.

Q. Name the other suppliers of Tri in the United States, Mr. Shepherd.

A. At the present?

Q. The manufacturers of Tri.

A. You mean at the present time?

Q. No, in 1951.

A. Well, Hooker, Detrex, Niagara Alkali, and Dow Chemical Company.

Q. To your knowledge, did any of those companies sell Tri to any other of the eight mills that you mentioned?

A. I don't know, in 1951. Detrex sold Tri to one or more of those mills before '51, we know that.

Q. Your answer is you can't state positively whether or not part of the supply was furnished by one of the other companies that you just named, one of the manufacturers?

A. No, sir.

Q. How many companies were there in the United States using the Tri method for processing meal for cattle feed at the end of 1951?

A. I have no certain knowledge of that. I would say most of them, that is all that I could say.

Q. At the end of 1951?

A. To the best of my knowledge, one company.

Q. To your knowledge, is any company in the United States, using the Tri process for manufacturing meal for cattle today?

A. No, sir, to the best of my knowledge, they are not.

Q. Mr. Shepherd, Mr. T. J. Milligan was one of your assistants in the years of 1949 and '50, was he not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Well, I hand you what purports to be an inter-office memorandum of the defendant, consisting of two pages; have you ever seen that before?

A. I believe I have seen it.

Q. Well, would you say that that was taken from the files of the defendant, Du Pont?

A. I don't know where that was taken from, sir.

Q. Well, is it part of the records of the defendant, Mr. Shepherd?

A. It should be.

Q. Do you know whether or not it is?

A. We only keep trade reports for three years, at which time they are sent to our hall of records.

Q. Well, do you know whether or not this was sent to me by your company?

A. No, sir, I do not.

Q. But you do say it is an inter-office memorandum of the defendant?

A. Yes, sir.

Mr. Brooks:

I would like to offer this as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 66. I think would be the number, if the Court please.

Mr. Thomas:

If Your Honor please, Exhibit 66, that is, All Plaintiffs' Exhibit 66, Du Pont objects to its introduction, for the reason that it has not been sufficiently authenticated or identified, and our further objection is that the person who made the statement is not present in the Court for examination.

The Court:

That objection would be overruled. That has been definitely identified by the witness as being part of the office records. He said he had seen it.

Mr. Brooks:

If the Court please, there are references in this memorandum or record, which I believe the witness said was an intercommunication or an inter-office memorandum, and it starts in headed "L. L. Ford Associates, Greenville, Mississippi.

Interviewed L. L. Ford, President", and its T. J Milligan and dated 7-14-50, using Tri solvent extract.

"The writer called at Greenville, Mississippi, to look over the 100 tons per day Tri soybean extraction plant that L. L. Ford is building for Magnolia Soy Products Company, directly owned by James Warren, formerly a cotton gin operator in Texas, and who now resides in Greenville, Mississippi. Ford constructed that complete plant, including the storage facilities, office and extraction plant for Magnolia. The storage bins and elevators were being erected during the writer's visit, and present indications were they were to complete the construction of the storage facilities so that Mr. Warren can buy fall beans and fill up the storage tank during the time the extraction and processing equipment was being installed, and they seemed to have a design and work very well in hand. He is, however, uninformed on many ideas in plant design. His statement to the writer indicated that he is staking his future on the operation of this plant, and that he considers a successful operation of the plant a prerequisite to any full scale operation to make vegetable oil from beans obtained in the Delta area. The equipment for the extraction plant be

constructed mostly by Davidson-Kennedy Company, who are hydraulic press manufacturers and who have had no previous experience with the construction or operation of an extraction plant. It appears that neither Mr. Ford nor Davidson-Kennedy are familiar with such a plant, and certainly a great share of the design burden, particularly the chemical engineering part, will have to be borne by members of our group, if this plant is to meet with success. Ford is willing, and everybody eager to have our suggestions and cooperation, and everyone seems to want to install a well-designed extraction plant, and apparently many vegetable oil processors who are potential customers in this cotton seed and soybean producing area, and I think we should watch that plant very closely, and will be influenced to order Tri extraction by the Greenville operation there, which will be one of the first large Tri extraction plants, and to keep that from being a failure, we must work with Ford, and do everything we can to keep him engaged on sound basis."

Mr. Brooks:

Mr. Shepherd, did you ever look into the scientific work in Europe on the question of the result of Tri meal being fed to cattle?

A. I read the report by chemists and toxicologists on those works. In fact, there were many experinents in Europe, and a good many men worked on this subject.

Q. That's true, there were a great number of scientists who worked on this particular subject over there for a number of years, isn't that right?

A. There were a number, yes.

Q. And on the whole, don't those works establish that the experiences in Europe with Tri extracted fed meal was very harmful to cattle?

A. No, not at all.

Well, now, the fact is, that that work that has been done where they have observed Tri meal and other feed, indicates maybe some association and gives no evidence of our product, as well as others using Tri extracted meal, have been injurious to cattle. As a matter of fact, one person there has been operating a Tri extraction plant for soybeans, but their actual operation of Tri plants for soybeans in Europe has not produced any of those bad results that you speak of.

Q. All right, Mr. Shepherd, do you know what recommendation as to the amount of that feed that should be given to a cow at one feeding?

A. They have had no difficulty in recent years, and we are in communication with them, and we have advised them of conditions here, and told them of this outbreak, and that we were stopping this program until we could find out if the meal has toxic factors, but over there, they have had no complaint.

Q. During the period 1940 to 1950, is it not a fact that a shipment did show that meal was very harmful, weren't you talking about that very recent experiment, although now they have reduced the feeding to the proper quarter pound or half pound a day?

A. No, I know nothing of the feeding level which you mentioned.

Q. You don't know about those things?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now after the so-called Cornell reports were in, did you or did not Du Pont have any submitted between that date, which was in 1938, '39 or '40, whenever this report was published?

A. That was in 1941.

Q. To 1950, did Du Pont conduct any other experiments in that country?

A. No, sir.

Q. None whatever?

A. We were not actively engaged or even interested in 1947. By that time, mills operating, feed mills, were the ones in the field.

Q. When the University of Iowa first started experimenting in this field, when was that?

A. I don't know.

Q. Well, you are aware that Iowa State College has done some work in that field, are you not?

A. I would state that Iowa College had done some of the work in that field, is that what you asked?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did it start experimenting in that field, Mr. Shepherd?

A. In connection with hemorrhagic disease of cattle?

Q. Yes, as a result of feeding Tri processed meal to cattle.

A. Well, I would say in 1950, to the best of my knowledge.

Q. 1950?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it not a fact that starting approximately 15 years ago, that experiments were made in this field?

A. What?

Q. That experiments were started on this subject by Iowa State College approximately 15 years ago?

A. Well, I misunderstood your question. They worked mainly with equipment.

Q. Well, didn't they conduct a controlled feeding experiment with a herd for a year?

A. I wouldn't call that a controlled experiment at any time. They merely used a fellow's barn and fed his herd.

Q. With regard to this outbreak in Colorado, did you ever send a copy of a report of that outbreak to Magnolia Soy Products Company, covering that incident, and on the outbreak, with the exception of the statement contained in the letter of T. J. Milligan, July 11, 1950?

A. I didn't say that we did. I don't think we did on that occasion.

Q. Do you recall about when Mr. Milligan brought on that last occasion that we talked about?

A. Not exactly.

Q. Now look at Exhibit 20. There is in evidence in this case, as All Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 20, a letter signed by T. J. Milligan, on the letterhead of E. I. Du Pont De Nemours, dated August 11, 1950, and in that letter, he mentions the matter of the Colorado incident; will you please read that paragraph on page 2, the second paragraph of the attachment on page 2. Read it please.

(The paragraph was read.)

Q. You read the second paragraph?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And in May a resolution was adopted as a result of that outbreak, wasn't it?

A. A resolution was adopted later on, yes.

Q. That—Do you know whether that later on there was an appendix—or can't you state whether or not you know that in that appendix, there was a reference to the Colorado outbreak, Mr. Shepherd?

A. That's a reference to the Colorado outbreak in that letter, sir.

Q. It was?

A. Yes, sir, it was.

Q. And this is the only report that the defendant ever submitted, the only reference that was ever made by the defendant to Magnolia of the Colorado outbreak?

A. I wouldn't say the only reference; maybe the only written report.

Q. Mr. Shepherd, when did you first hear of the outbreak in Minnesota in the year 1951?

A. In the early spring.

Q. Could you be more accurate in that statement, please, sir?

A. I am not sure, but I know it was in the spring, and as I recall, it was either late March, probably late March, or early April. That's as close as I can pin it down.

Q. Did you hear of the outbreak in January of 1951?

A. No, sir.

Q. You heard nothing about that?

A. To the best of my knowledge, no.

Q. Did you ever hear of the deaths of 41 cows and calves in the Glencoe area in Minnesota by April 26, 1951?

A. I don't remember the number, but I heard of that outbreak by April 26.

Q. Did you know of the mortality in a herd, that out of 30 cattle in Glencoe, that 22 died; that's in the Glencoe area in Minnesota, by the end of June, 1951?

A. That was when we were investigating those incidents.

Q. Did you ever receive a report at that time from the University of Minnesota?

A. We were in constant touch, either by letter or personal visits, with the University of Minnesota.

Q. When did you first hear of the death of the calf that died on July 9, 1951, the calf, one of these calves used by Doctor Twehouse and Leasure in their experiment that started approximately in April?

A. Well, I couldn't recall the exact date. It would probably be in early August.

Q. You were receiving frequent reports from the University of Minnesota by that date, were you not, Mr. Shepherd?

A. Research work hadn't progressed far enough to have a written report to it. We got some verbal reports by then.

Q. To your knowledge, has the defendant ever sent a copy of any report from the University of Minnesota to Magnolia Soy Products Company, or any of its officers?

A. Not to my knowledge. As I say, I don't recall getting a report from Minnesota in 1951.

Q. Do you know whether the 41 cows and calves that I just mentioned that died by April 26, 1951, were mentioned, or that fact made known in writing to the Magnolia Soy Products Company or any of its officers?

A. In the letter of July 31, we referred to the Minnesota experiment.

Q. Is there any reference in your letter of July 31 with regard to the number of cattle that died in Minnesota?

A. That was one of the reasons for sending Mr. Armstrong with that letter.

Q. Mr. Shepherd, is there any reference in your letter of July 31 as to the number of cattle that died in Minnesota?

A. No.

Q. None whatever, is there?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you send any of your assistants to the Glencoe mill in Minnesota?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you aware of the operation of that mill?

A. I am not personally.

Q. Was it an efficiently operated mill?

A. To the best of my knowledge, it was.

Q. Have you any knowledge of the heats maintained by that mill?

A. Not personal knowledge, no.

Q. Do you know whether the defendant's records show that you knew the heat maintained by that mill?

A. I can't specifically state that our records do indicate that that was known. I can state that mills made by Crown did give very complete heating or toasting.

Q. You just testified it was an efficient plant?

A. Yes, sir, to the best of my knowledge.

Q. Well, do the records of the defendant show that the mill maintained heat in excess of 240 degrees Fahrenheit?

A. I can't answer that. I have no knowledge of that.

Q. Well, do any records of the defendant show what heats were maintained in that place?

A. They might. I don't know.

Q. Most of the cattle that died in Minnesota in 1951 were in the so-called Glencoe area, is that true, Mr. Shepherd?

A. Well, they died in the Minnesota area in several points.

Q. You don't know whether the deaths occurred in the so-called Glencoe area?

A. I know som of them did, yes.

Q. And a great deal of Tri meal that had been sold in the field out there vas the output manufactured by this Glencoe mill, isn't that correct?

A. That was so.

Q. Now you referred in your letter of July 31, 1951, the letter that was delivered by Mr. Armstrong to Mr. Ford and Mr. Reed; after that date, did you have communications with Magnolia or any of its officers, Mr. Shepherd?

A. I did not.

Q. By letter or by phone?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever make any inquiry even as to whether that mill was producing soybean meal, did you ever inquire as to whether or not it might be selling some of that for feed for cattle?

A. I did not.

Q. You just washed your hands of the whole thing after July 31, 1951, didn't you, Mr. Shepherd?

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know if the defendant sold more Tri to Magnolia in November of 1951, do you know about that?

A. I know we made a shipment in November in 1951.

Q. You referred to a resolution here by the National Feed Association, now did you after July 31, on the drum or in any way label your process that you sold Magnolia?

A. I don't know.

Q. You don't know whether you did or did not?

A. No, sir.

Q. You knew that cattle was dying in Minnesota, you just testified

A. We heard that they were in Minnesota in some areas.

Q. You are head of the Chlorine Products Division.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you didn't even know whether your company was putting a label on the drums that they were sending to Magnolia, drums of Tri, I mean?

A. I don't know. I expect they did without my knowledge.

Q. Are we to understand that you did not think it important enough to know whether your drums were properly labeled?

A. It never occurred to us that Magnolia would do other than what we had suggested in our letter.

Q. You did not think it important enough to label your drums was my question, Mr. Shepherd, drums of Tri that you were shipping, after you knew cattle were dying in Minnesota and other places?

A. I say it just never occurred to us that Magnolia wouldn't follow our instructions. Other mills without any further instructions from our part about the meal, followed the suggestion of the letter that we sent dated on July 31, and we never inquired of a mill where they sold their products or why. We have no authority to tell a mill where to sell. That would be presumptuous to question the integrity of any of our responsible customers in that manner, and we didn't do it. We simply supposed that they followed the suggestions of the letter of July 31, which were very plain.

Q. Mr. Shepherd, now these other companies that you referred to, did you cooperate with them as close-

-ly as you had with Magnolia, its officers, I mean as you did with the officers of Magnolia, prior to the construction of their plant?

A. Insofar as our company was concerned, we always complied and gave such companies any assistance as to the solvent recovery plants, that is, the erection of plants using Tri as a solvent for the extraction of meal, and naturally we gave them the best advice we could as to the proper erection of that solvent recovery plant.

Q. Now your assistance to those companies, was that assistance in writing of the same type of letter to them that T. J. Milligan wrote to the incorporators and later to the officers of Magnolia?

A. To what letters, Mr. Brooks, are you referring?

Q. I am referring to the letter that belittled all so-called rumors as smear campaigns?

A. That letter was specifically requested by L. L. Ford, and I read the whole letter, and the effect of it is, that those rumors would be minimized.

Q. Well, that letter was written at the request of Mr. Ford, you say?

A. It was.

Q. Well, he didn't request what you put in the letter, but he asked T. J. Milligan to put in writing whether any of the rumors which had been circulating were true, didn't he tell you that he just wanted the truth, and that letter of August 11 was the answer; now was that true?

A. Mr. Brooks, I never heard that statement by Ford or saw it either.

Q. Mr. L. L. Ford so testified and it is part of the evidence in the Ladner case against Du Pont at Poplarville, Mississippi, knowing these cases that took place a great many months ago, are you now at this stage, denying that statement, Mr. Shepherd?

A. I deny any knowledge of it.

Q. I hand you a photostatic copy of the letter and report, the report is that of M. O. Shultz of the University of Minnesota, will you examine that and please state if that report was received by the defendant?

A. I did not receive that report personally, and I couldn't say, but this looks though that it could be a copy of the report received by Du Pont. That went to another group, not to me.

Q. You state that was or was not received?

A. I never saw that report personally.

Q. You've never seen this report?

A. No, sir.

Q. You don't identify this photostat of the original as having been received by the defendant?

A. I can't. I never have seen the letter. I think the toxicology lab would be in position to discuss this.

Q. Well, would you say the report was not received by the defendant?

A. I don't know.

Q. You don't know?

A. No, sir.

Q. From looking at this photostatic copy, would you say probably at least they are copies of letters interchanged in the regular course of business by the defendant? Now take a good look.

A. That does show most of a stamp, and on receipt of letters, most of Du Pont's divisions stamp the date on which it was received by that department, and in some cases, the distribution shows on the letters. That has been shown on some of the letters that you have passed to me; some of them, it hasn't. I can't say.

Mr. Brooks:

If the Court please, defendant furnished that photostatic copy to me, and we would like to offer it in evidence.

Mr. Thomas:

We don't object to that. It is not a copy that comes from the defendant's files, but we do object to it on the ground that it is written by a man who is not present for cross examination, and the letter is not authenticated, as to the facts, and we don't see where it could possibly be competent without that person being here, because if he isn't here, why that letter is merely hearsay, if Your Honor please.

The Court:

I think the Court ruled on that the other day that it might be used in cross examination, but it wasn't testimony. Now that ruling was made the other day.

Mr. Brooks:

I don't think, if the Court please, that your ruling applied to a communication such as this.

The Court:

Let me see that. This might be a different situation.

(The document was passed to the Court for examination.)

Mr. Brooks:

If Your Honor please, we have this testimony from Mr. Shepherd, and from Mr. Armstrong. The record shows that he testified that there was a contract entered into with the University of Minnesota, with re-

gard to experiments there; we have testimony from Mr. Shepherd that he received reports, and frequently. Now that is one of their reports, sir, that they gave to me.

The Court:

It is admissible, gentlemen, not so much in as far as the jury is concerned, as to the truth or falsity of the statement, but as to the fact that Du Pont had this information, whether it be true or false. Go ahead.

(By Mr. Brooks):

Q. You say you never read this report?

A. No, sir.

Q. Then you are not in any way familiar with it?

A. Our toxicological laboratory supervises those reports. We don't necessarily read the report.

Q. So you just get reports and don't know anything about them and don't do anything about them?

A. They are channelled to the proper person, Mr. Brooks.

Q. Now Mr. Shepherd, you received a summary of this report?

A. It was probably verbal, except that appears to be an interim report of some sort.

Q. You don't recall receiving any written memorandum of another department in regard to it?

A. No.

Q. Did you know whether that report showed that the experiment divided the cattle into five sections, and they had been considered, and the report showed all of the cattle in Group 3 that were fed Tri extracted meal, that every one died?

Mr. Thomas:

We object to that, if the Court please. That is not admissible to the jury. Someone made that report that is not available for cross examination, and we say that referring to what is said in that report is not competent at this time. This man didn't make the report, and the one who did it is not here for examination, so the report is hearsay.

The Court:

Well, I'll say this to you, gentlemen, whether that is true or false, it's not in issue here, but the fact that the Du Pont people got that report, I think it's competent, and I think you may go ahead and refer to the report, and ask him if that's in the report. Don't ask him whether it is true or false or not, but whether the report came to them, and if you want to ask about it, you can ask if certain things are in it, but do not ask the witness if it is true or false. That has nothing to do with the issue here. The only thing competent is that the report was received and certain things are in it. Go ahead.

Q. Is that statement that I made to which Mr. Thomas objected in this report or not, Mr. Shepherd?

A. I don't know.

Q. Now, Mr. Shepherd, will you please look at that report, and see if the statement I just made is reflected in that report.

(After examining the report, the witness replied):

A. Yes, it does.

Q. It does contain that statement?

A. It contains the statement that all animals in Group 3 died

Q. Do you know whether a copy of that report was ever sent by the defendant Du Pont to Magnolia Soy Products Company or any of its officers, Mr. Shepherd?

A. According to the date on that report, I didn't receive it until July of '52—no, I beg your pardon, I didn't receive it until—it was in July, and by that time, Magnolia was not operating.

Q. My question was, do you know whether or not the defendant sent a copy of that report to Magnolia Soy Products Company?

A. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Brooks:
That is all at this time.

The Court:
Is there any further examination of this witness?

Mr. Thomas:
What did you say, Mr. Brooks?

Mr. Brooks:
I said that was the last question.

Mr. Thomas:
We have nothing further.

The Court:
Then you may be excused, Mr. Shepherd.

(Witness excused.)

• • • • • • • •

If the Court please, at the close of all the evidence in the case, defendant Du Pont here makes a motion for a directed verdict in its favor as to the entire case in all counts, and asks permission of this Honorable Court to have formal written motion in this regard filed with the reporter and made a part of the record as if dictated the specific grounds therein.

The Court:

You are given permission, of course, to do that.

Mr. Thomas:

All right, sir; and I believe the ruling of the Court was overruling that motion.

The Court:

Yes, sir; I do not think it is a case for a directed verdict.

• • • • • • • •

Mr. Thomas:

If Your Honor please, this Honorable Court now having overruled the motions for a directed verdict in behalf of the defendant, defendant Du Pont now moves for a directed verdict as to the contract counts, namely counts one, two,--inasmuch as Count three is now deleted from the case and asks permission of this Honorable Court to file a formal written motion in this regard, setting forth the specific grounds therein.

The Court:

Very well, you may do so.

Mr. Thomas:

I will likewise file that motion with the reporter and with the clerk.

The Court:

Very well.

(Motion for directed verdict as to the contract was filed as part of the record in this case.)

The Court:

Of course, that is also overruled, gentlemen. I neglected to say that.

• • • • • •

The Court:

Take this, Mr. Reporter:

Now, Gentlemen of the Jury, after a long and tedious hearing which has been somewhat enlivened by the testimony of Mr. Souza and others, this matter has come to the stage where it becomes my duty to charge you with respect to the law therefor and to briefly review for you the evidence which has been introduced.

I do not want any misunderstanding with me or you gentlemen or with counsel because at times throughout this proceeding we have had a little levity connected with it in connection with some of the rather peculiar testimony, that is the peculiar language, that the Court does not regard it as a very serious matter or that you should not regard it as a very serious matter. There are serious rights of your fellow citizens and those rights are entitled to your

most serious consideration, as I have tried to give them my serious consideration.

It seems to me that there are certain matters in this law suit which stand out so clearly and unequivocally that there can be no serious question, as a matter of fact, no question under the evidence.

This picture has been presented to you, as I have said before out of your presence, very much like a person who is undertaking to work a jig saw puzzle. You put in a piece here and a piece there, and a piece there, and a piece there and finally you have the full picture appearing.

Now to me it seems there can be no question in the world under this evidence that long before, or for a considerable period of time before the unfortunate events which we have been called upon to pass on occurred, that there was in the oil meal industry and in those who supplied that industry both with machinery and with chemicals, an effort to find a more satisfactory process for the manufacture, particularly in that type of manufacture which was based on a chemical extraction process. That was based on two factors, first, probably a more satisfactory recovery of the solvent extract; but primarily to reduce the fire hazard, the explosive hazard. The type of chemical which had been used up to this time largely was quite volatile, quite prone to explode, and there was thus a seeking among those people interested in this subject to define some type of a solvent which would be less explosive. I dont think there could be any question in the world in any reasonable man's mind that the defendant Du Pont here was interested in that under the evidence in this case; that they were seeking along with other people to bring this result about and that their motive while it was good

was not an eleemosynary motive, but was brought about by their desire to be able to sell more of the particular chemical involved here, trichloroethylene, which is frequently referred to in this record as "tri".

There can be no question in the world under the evidence in this case, as I see it at least, and as I think any reasonable man would see it, that they collaborated with the people, Mr. Reed, Mr. Ford, and possibly others who were interested in establishing the Magnolia Soy Bean Products Company at Greenville, Mississippi. There can be no question in any reasonable man's mind that as the result of their investigation, I am sure made in good faith, but at the same time the representation was made, that trichloroethylene processed soybean oil was a safe product to be used in the feeding of cattle. I think there is one letter in the record from the defendant in which they said, practically said they would stake their reputation on that being a fact.

Therefore, there are to my mind, and I think in any reasonable man's mind, certain things that are definitely and specifically established by the evidence in this case. That is that Du Pont did hold out to these people that they could manufacture trichloroethylene extracted soybean oil and it would be safe for cattle feed; that they did so manufacture, that in the processes of trade certain of their products marked 'Magnolia Soybean Meal" through a broker in Memphis, a Mr. Brodie, were eventually sold to Waldron, Limited, in Honolulu, by Waldron Limited to the Sokei and Hilo Dairies, and that as a result of the feeding of that meal these cattle died. I do not think any reasonable man could come to any other conclusion about that.

I further think, and tell you as a matter of law in this case that although as yet the chemists have not been able to say just precisely what the chemical reaction is, that in this case the evidence overwhelmingly shows that the feeding of trichloroethylene extracted soybean oil under certain conditions does kill cattle, give them this hemorrhagic disease, not in all instances, but in some instances does kill cattle and that that was the cause of the death of the cattle that are involved in this lawsuit.

The very serious question which arises in this case, and in my judgment the case is to be determined by what you gentlemen may think of the factual situation which arises here with respect to the effect of the letter which was sent by Du Pont to Magnolia Soybean Products Company on or about August 1, 1951, I believe is the date,—

Mr. Thomas:

It was written July 31 and delivered August 3, 1951, Your Honor.

The Court:

Well, I say it was delivered on or about August 1, 1951, to Mr. Reed, and was a letter written by Mr. Shepherd and delivered by Mr. Armstrong of the Du Pont Company to Mr. Reed and his associates. You recall what the letter said. That, by the defendant is alleged to have broken the chain of causation in this case. If it did not break the chain of causation from the legal standpoint in this case, I think your verdict would bound to be for the plaintiffs in this case. If it did break the chain of causation then your verdict should be for the defendants in this case.

Now the breaking of the chain of causation is a somewhat complicated matter, one that isn't very easy to define, but I think this is a reasonably accurate statement. That you gentlemen should take into consideration the facts and circumstances as you may find them in connection with the delivery of that letter. Take into consideration the letter itself, what Mr. Armstrong may or may not have said to Magnolia Soy Products Company at the time the letter was delivered and what they may have said to him, those being disputed issues in this lawsuit; the testimony, the testimony with respect to which I will briefly review for you in a little while.

If you should believe from a preponderance of the evidence in this case, that the defendants sold tri solvent to the Magnolia Soy Products Company knowing that it was to be used by that company in the manufacture of soybean oil for sale in Interstate Commerce as cattle feed, and that the action of the defendants prior to the sale of the soybean meal which was ultimately purchased by plaintiffs and used in feeding their cattle, or prior to the time when they received the same in the Territory of Hawaii, were not such as would have caused a reasonably prudent man to desist in selling such meal for cattle feed, or was such that a reasonably prudent man in the position of the defendant knew, or should have known that the said company, that is, referring to Magnolia Soy Products Company, would continue to sell said meal in interstate commerce for cattle feed and would not have regarded the sale of this meal, tri meal, for cattle feed by said company, again referring to the Magnolia Soy Products Company, or I should say Magnolia Soybean Products Company, as extraordinary under the circumstances, then your verdict would be for the plaintiff.

Now the factual issue on that, gentlemen, you have heard the letter read, so you know what the letter says. Mr. Ford in his deposition said that when that letter was brought to him he was shocked and indignant and that he said to Mr. Armstrong "What do you mean by this? You let me put $500,000.00 here in the operation to produce a mill to operate by this process. You know I can't sell this for hog feed or poultry feed, I have got to sell it as cattle feed. Do you mean to tell me that I have got to stop doing that?"

He says Mr. Armstrong told him "no, we don't mean that; but there have been some rumors circulated about it and we thought you ought to know about those rumors", and that is about the sum and substance of what we mean to say to you."

Now Mr. Armstrong in his testimony given here before you denies that entirely. He says he didn't make any such statement as that. That is a factual question, gentlemen, for you to determine as to which one of those witnesses you believe about it. And it is for you to conclude under the definition which I have given you whether that was a break in the chain of causation in this case. If it was, then your verdict in this case should be for the defendants, if it was not, your judgment in my opinion should be for the plaintiffs. That is the question which you gentlemen are to determine.

The plaintiffs in this case came in here as do all plaintiffs in lawsuits come in with the burden of proving his case by a preponderance of the evidence, not as in a criminal case beyond all reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty, but by a preponderance or greater weight of the evidence. That applies throughout this lawsuit and to the question of damages of

course. If you do not feel that the plaintiffs are entitled to win this lawsuit, the form of your verdict would be, "We, the jury find for the defendants." If you do think the plaintiffs are entitled to win this lawsuit, and you will bear in mind, gentlemen, that we have tried three separate cases here as one, because they were all dependent generally upon the same question of fact, the only difference in the three cases is if you think the plaintiffs are entitled to prevail, is in the amount of damages to which they are entitled.

If you should think that the plaintiffs are entitled to prevail in this lawsuit you would then you would pass to the question of how much each of these plaintiffs have been damaged in this lawsuit. You will bear in mind that the plaintiffs are two dairies operating in the Hawaiian Islands, and the plaintiff, Waldron, Limited, which is a concern there under this evidence which deals largely in feed.

The first one of the plaintiffs which I will refer to here is generally referred to in this record as the Hilo Dairy. These people under the evidence in this case had fifty-one cows that died, they had forty-four milking cattle whom they testified were badly damaged in their milk production and in their value as a result of the feeding of this particular brand of meal. In addition to their losses in the death and the damage of their cattle, they claim losses with respect to loss in business, and also some loss with respect to the trade value there, the trade name. They had medical expense according to this evidence in connection with this matter of $4,990.00. The testimony of those particular people with respect to the values of their cows were that their milking cows, their reasonably good milking cows, had a value of

approximately $800.00 apiece. They had two cows which they said had a very special value, one of which it was testified to, was producing about twelve gallons of milk per day, a very fine Holstein cow and a calf from that cow which gave great promise, which they say was worth, each of those they say was worth $5,000.00.

The Sokei Dairy had fifty-two cows which died, they had fifty-one calves that died, thirty of which were bull calves and twenty-one were heifers. They say their milking cows were worth about $800.00 apiece; that the bull calves were worth about $200.00 apiece and that their heifer calves were around $400.00 apiece. Practically all of the cattle involved, not absolutely so, but from a practical standpoint you could say they were all Holsteins, there were a few Ayrshires and Guernseys mixed in, but the bulk of this lot of cattle were Holstein cattle.

You heard the testimony of a good many witnesses as to why cattle on the Hawaiian Islands were higher in price than they were on the mainland. In the main they had to be purchased here. There was quite a large item of freight, transportation and so forth involved; there is a good deal of testimony from other people in this lawsuit with respect to cattle somewhat if not entirely similar in character with respect to the value of cattle down there. Those estimates ran, as I recall them, and I think I am fairly accurate in that, all the way from some as low as $400.00 up to maximum of about $800.00. Now those are things for you to take into consideration in determining, if you should decide the plaintiffs are entitled to recover in this case, what their recovery should be.

Mr. Waldron, or Waldron, Limited, the firm down there, seems to have accepted as a fact that they

would be liable in this case if sued. They have made settlements with a number of people down there in the islands which, as I understand counsel, have been agreed are reasonable settlements. I have made no notations about that, I take it that counsel has those figures, and those, of course, would be elements of damage as far as they are concerned. They testify that they lost quite a good deal of business, that they were very much embarrassed by the fact that they unwittingly, as they say, had put out meal for cattle which proved to be poisonous, that it seriously damaged their business; that they lost business because of it; that the reputation of their firm has suffered because of it; that they had to spend quite a good deal of money in putting their salesmen out and their officers out to try to counteract the bad impression which had been left by this. All of that is for you gentlemen to determine if you should think they are entitled to recover and fix for them a reasonable value for what they have lost.

There might possibly be in this case, under the evidence, a question of the loss of prospective profits. I do not think you gentlemen ought to consider that. The prospective profits phase of it I think is entirely speculative and ought not to be considered, but if you should determine from the evidence in the case that the plaintiffs are entitled to a recovery, they are clearly entitled to recover at your hands the full, fair, cash market value of the losses which they suffered, the use of their employees and their officers and any extra work that they were put to in connection with this in addition to the actual loss from the death of cattle and from claims which they have been compelled to admit that they owe and which they have obligated themselves to pay.

Now, gentlemen, I think in as simple language as I know how to use, language which is the layman's language rather than the lawyer s language, language which I think you can understand better than if I used a lot of high sounding and legal phrases. I have stated to you gentlemen what the issues in this lawsuit are. Your duty in the matter is simply this.

Du Pont, as you know without me telling you, is a very large corporation. They are engaged in many lines of activities. There is nothing wrong about being a corporation. There is nothing wrong about being a big corporation and doing a big business, and you ought not in this lawsuit to be prejudiced against Du Pont because of it, because of the fact that it is a big corporation and does do a big business.

On the other hand you should in no way in the world be prejudiced against the plaintiffs in this case because they are a long, long way away from us. They are people that you know little about, but they are citizens of the United States, and they are entitled to every right and every privilege of a citizen of the United States, including the right to have 12 of their fellow citizens fairly pass on their lawsuits when they come before them.

Now there is your situation. Take this evidence, do your best to ferret it out and then reach what in your judgment is a just and fair verdict, and neither I, nor the plaintiffs, nor the defendant, nor anyone else will have cause to complain.

Are there any exceptions or objections, gentlemen, to the charge as given or any requests for any additional instructions?

Mr. Brooks:

May we have two or three minutes, Your Honor, for a brief consultation?

The Court:
Yes, sir.

(Whereupon a short consultation was had by plaintiffs' counsel at the conclusion of which Mr. Tavares said):

Mr. Tavares:
May we at this time impose upon the Court by asking for a short conference in chambers?

The Court:
Yes, sir.

(Whereupon a conference between the Court and counsel for all parties was held in chambers, and at the end of the conference the parties returned to the Courtroom and the Court said):

The Court:
Gentlemen, there are some other very short matters which I overlooked or did not charge you about which I should.

For the benefit of some of you gentlemen who possibly have sat on juries in State Courts, where the nine jury verdict prevails, I charge you that in this case the verdict must be the verdict of all twelve of you, it can't be a verdict in this Court unless all twelve jurors agree.

There is one further matter which you probably need to have clarified for you. There is some little reference in the evidence in this case to the fact that in connection both with the Hilo Dairy and with the Sokei Dairy that the plaintiff Waldron in this case advanced certain sums of money to them. That you

shall not take into consideration with regard to Hilo or to Sokei; if you should think they are entitled to prevail, your verdict would be for such damages as you think they have suffered, not taking into consideration at all any advancement which may have been made to them by Waldron. That matter would have to be, and would be adjusted by the Court. You would take that into consideration on this one narrow question in this lawsuit and that question alone. That is the question of whether or not the making of those advances took from Waldron the use of a considerable sum of money and put him in a tight credit position where he was not able to advance credit to his customers as he heretofore had and whether he suffered loss on account of it. It is competent for you gentlemen to consider it on that question, but that question alone.

Mr. Thomas:

I believe the Court asked if there were any objections or exceptions.

Mr. Brooks:

That is correct, you go ahead.

Mr. Thomas:

No; you are first.

Mr. Brooks:

I merely want to say to the Court in view of the conference we just had in chambers, a change must be made in those charts, sir.

The Court:

Very well.

Mr. Tavares:
That is all at this time, I believe, sir.

Mr. Thomas:
Your Honor, may I just briefly dictate the exceptions, sir?

The Court:
Yes, sir.

Mr. Thomas:
With utmost deference to this Honorable Court, the defendant objects to and takes exception to the statements made by Your Honor attributed to Mr. Armstrong which amount or might reasonably be said to amount to a deviation from the letter of July 31, 1951, delivered on August 3, 1951.

The Court:
Very well.

Mr. Thomas:
The exceptions are overruled, aren't they, Judge?

The Court:
Yes, it is overruled, because as I have said to you gentlemen, and I say to the jury, this letter stands as it is written, gentlemen, nothing that Mr. Armstrong said detracts from or adds to the letter as a letter. Mr. Armstrong, whatever you gentlemen may find he said or didn't say, is admissible in this case only as a statement from an agent of the defendant in this case, and does not in any sense of the word undertake to change the language of the letter.

Mr. Tavares:

For the record, Your Honor, may we most respectfully raise the question of law by excepting to the Court's ruling, ruling out possible prospective profits?

The Court:

Yes, sir, you may do that.

Now as I understand you gentlemen, you think you can reasonably cover your case in an hour argument to the side. That you will be given. Mr. Marshal, you will keep the time.

Now perhaps in a little more spirit of levity than a Court ought to indulge in, but we have had enough serious situations in this matter, I think a little levity might not be out of place.

I took a contract a long time ago with the Government of the United States to act as a Judge and preside over trials. I have never considered that contract as binding me to listen to all of the arguments of counsel presented to a jury, that is the unfortunate province of the jury in this case, and I am not going to sit here and listen to it all. I am going to be right back here, though, but I think I know you gentlemen well enough to know that you will stay within the record and the instructions of the Court, but if any question arises about the propriety or lack of propriety of the arguments in this case, I will be within earshot and you may call me, but I absolutely refuse to sit here and listen to you gentlemen argue the case to the jury.

(During the course of Mr. Brooks' argument the following colloquy and ruling by the Court occurred.)

Mr. Brooks:
—"the veterinarian's bill out there—"

Mr. Thomas:
If Your Honor please, we object to the use of charts inasmuch as they were not prepared or formulated during the evidence in this case.

The Court:
Well, do you contend that they do not conform to the evidence in the case?

Mr. Thomas:
We haven't even seen them, Judge.

The Court:
Well, look at them and then answer that question.

Mr. Thomas:
All right, sir.

(Whereupon counsel for defendant examined the charts being referred to by counsel for plaintiffs.)

They reflect the damages which are complained of and claimed in the complaint, but we submit that there are certain items of damages claimed, for instance in support of which there is no evidence supporting it. For example this "General Damages, $30,000.00."

The Court:
What theory is this "general damage" based on, Mr. Brooks?

Mr. Brooks:

General damages, Your Honor, the same as all general damages; just as to any emergency or anything unforeseen as might happen in the future. General damages, I think the Court will agree are always allowed in such cases.

Mr. Thomas:

We submit that unless it conforms to the proof, Judge, the charts here, merely setting forth the complaint, balloons it out of proportion and prejudices the defendant in this case.

The Court:

Well, now gentlemen of the jury, if I correctly understand the situation, this chart here is merely a method of calling your attention to the evidence in the case. I think it is competent for that. The chart in itself is no evidence in the world, and your verdict in this case is to be based on the evidence, and this is merely a method that counsel is using to undertake to call to your attention what the evidence in the case shows.

Mr. Thomas:

Would that be counsel's recollection of the evidence, if Your Honor please, or the evidence?

The Court:

It is counsel's recollection of what the evidence shows. Of course the jury can judge what the evidence was, and this is merely a method of counsel, as I understand it, to call the attention of the jury as to what he claims as damages and what he claims the evidence shows. If the jury does not agree with

him that the evidence shows that, why of course the jury will take the evidence and not the chart. I think it is competent for that, but for that only. It in itself, of course, gentlemen, is no evidence in the world. The evidence given you here from the stand and from the depositions in the evidence which shall control.

All right, gentlemen, you may begin your arguments after we come back here from lunch. Court will now take a recess until 1:45, at which time the arguments may be concluded.

Gentlemen, you will follow the same instructions which I gave you the first day of Court, which I am sure are not necessary, but I call your attention to them just the same.

Court is now in recess until 1:45 p.m.

(Whereupon, Court adjourned at 12:05 p.m., until 1:45 p.m., Tuesday, November 29, 1955.)

Afternoon Session.

(Following the noon recess, Court reconvened and the trial was resumed.)

The Court:

All right, gentlemen, you may continue.

(Whereupon, the arguments were concluded, at the conclusion of which, the Court said):

The Court:

Now before the jury takes this case for its consideration, I wish to express publicly my appreciation to the jury for their attention, and I particularly wish to express my appreciation to counsel in the

case. They have been courteous to each other and to the Court. They fought for their clients rights and while they fought hard, they fought fairly, and for the most part it has been a friendly combat. The case has been well handled and to you gentlemen, I express my appreciation. It is a privilege to try a lawsuit such as this.

Now, gentlemen of the jury, since I charged you this morning, I have had the reporter read back the charge and I make no change with one or two minor exceptions.

It is a little difficult for a man sitting here and talking and then see his words precisely as he said them, and I notice I did in one or two instances use the words "oil", or "soybean oil" for use as cattle feed. I am sure you knew I meant "soybean meal". That is the only thing that I make a change in my original charge to you.

Now I instruct you just this much further, gentlemen. If you should believe from the preponderance of the evidence in this case that the plaintiffs are entitled to prevail, the form of your verdict would be this:

"We, the jury, find for the plaintiffs and fix their damages as follows"—

and then set out what you think Hilo Dairy is entitled in your judgment to recover, then how much as to Sokei Dairy and how much Waldron, Limited is entitled to recover.

If you should feel that the plaintiffs have not borne the burden imposed by law in proving their case by a preponderance of the evidence and the plaintiffs are not entitled to recover, the form of your verdict would be

"We, the jury, find for the defendant."

Now I will give you gentlemen these two forms of verdict and you will use whichever one you feel is proper.

Now, gentlemen, you may retire to your room and begin your deliberations.

(Whereupon the jury retired.)

Th Court:

Mr. Reporter, take this into the record.

There were presented to the Court in this case a number of instructions requested for the plaintiffs and for the defendants which the Court will hand to you and which shall be marked as "Proposed Instructions" in this case.

The Court has considered these instructions and while quite a number of them are correct theoretical statements of law, the Court did not give these instructions because of the fact that under the very limited factual situation which the Court found existed in this case, the Court was of the opinion and still is of the opinion that the jury would get a more intelligent idea of the issue on which they had to pass than it would have if the Court had read certain of the requests to charge couched in more or less legalistic language.

Mr. Tavares:

If the Court please, may we withdraw the instructions requested and sign them I don't believe we did that, and I think it is required.

The Court:

Well, you may do it if you wish There is no reason why you shouldn't.

(Whereupon, the plaintiffs' requests to charge which were denied by the Court were withdrawn and signed.)

Mr. Brooks:

And may it please Your Honor, may we be permitted to except to the Court's ruling in denying the submission of the Proposed Instructions to the jury.

The Court:

Oh, certainly, gentlemen, you may have an exception to that. You have a right to except to any ruling of the Court.

Mr. Brooks:

Thank you, sir.

(After deliberation, the jury returned into open Court the following verdict):

The Court:

Gentlemen of the Jury, have you reached a verdict?

The Foreman:

We have, if Your Honor please.

The Court:

Pass it to the Clerk.

(The verdict was passed to the Clerk.)

The Court:

Read the verdict, Mr. Clerk.

The Clerk.

(Reading) "We the jury find for the defendant."

The Court:

Thank you gentlemen for your consideration and for your patient attention during the trial of this rather lengthy case. You have the thanks of the Court, and I hope that we may again meet. You are now discharged from any further consideration of this case. Unfortunately, we have another case to try, so you will just take your places back in the Courtroom.

Mr. Brooks:

If the Court please, we would like to reserve the right to make a formal motion for a new trial at a later date, convenient to Your Honor and opposing counsel.

The Court:

Certainly, sir; you may do that at Oxford when it is convenient to you gentlemen.

Mr. Brooks:

We just wish to protect our rights in the record, if the Court please.

The Court:

I understand.

Well, gentlemen, that, I presume, concludes all matters to be heard at this time.

Court is now recessed for thirty minutes.

(Whereupon the trial in the above-styled cause was concluded.)

• • • • • • • •

ORAL OPINION OVERRULING MOTION.

The Court:

Take this, Mr. Reporter.

In this long and complicated and very interesting lawsuit the Court gave the Plaintiffs what amounted to peremptory instructions on every issue raised in the lawsuit with one exception, that being insofar as liability was concerned.

That was a sharply drawn factual issue as to whether or not the conduct of Du Pont, the defendant in the case, had resulted in a break in the chain of causation. That issue, I thought then and think now, was an issue for the jury.

As I look back over the lawsuit I am inclined to say the Court did commit one error, but it would not be applicable here. I probably confined the Plaintiffs to a too narrow gauge of estimate of damages if found, but the jury found the plaintiffs were entitled to none, therefore, that is not applicable here.

The Court gave instructions requested by the Plaintiffs on the question of the break in the chain of causation word for word as requested.

There were other instructions which were requested and I think they were covered in the general charge to the jury in language which the jury would come more nearly understanding that they would any technical charge which might have been given.

I think the case was fairly and fully presented to the jury and arguments that were made to the jury covered practically every matter which is now being argued here, and the jury found the facts to be against the Plaintiffs in the case.

Therefore, in my judgment, the motion for a new trial would be overruled.

CERTIFICATE OF CLERK.

In the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Mississippi, Greenville Division.

George T. Nishida and James E. Nishida, doing business as Hilo Dairy Company of Kauai, a co-partnership, Plaintiffs,

v. No. 142-Civil.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, Defendant.

Ryoju Sokei, doing business as Sokei Dairy, Plaintiff,

v. No. 145-Civil.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, Defendant.

Fred L. Waldron, Limited, Plaintiff,

v. No. 143-Civil.

E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company, a corporation, Defendant.

I, HUBERT D. STEPHENS, JR., Clerk of the United States District Court for the Greenville Division of the Northern District of Mississippi, do hereby certify that foregoing 874 pages is the original of portions of the record in the above styled cases stipulated by attorneys for the parties as the record in said causes on appeal thereof to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Witness my signature and seal of office this 31 day of May, 1956.

HUBERT D. STEPHENS, JR.,
Clerk,
By GENA S. LAMB,
(Gena S. Lamb),
Deputy Clerk

(Seal)